ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/15/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED000028

2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7366

3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Technical Comm. on Selection and Retention of Students

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Selection and Retention of Students in California's Institutions of Higher Education

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. State Dept. of Edu.
ST. 721 Capitol Ave.
CITY, STATE Sacramento, Cal.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE California: State Department of Education

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
		61	79

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

students	public schools	enrollments		
admissions	non-public	financial aid		
retention	required courses	junior colleges		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Report of a committee to study the problems of selection and retention of students in California public and private institutions of higher education. The study deals with the proportion of California students attending college in California, opportunities for college study in California in comparison with other States, measures of the validity of entrance requirements, admission policies and procedures, and policies and procedures in retention and classification of students.

The conclusions and recommendations cover:

1. Basic assumptions on selection, retention, and enrollment limitations.
2. Improvement in admission or selection procedure.
3. Retention policies.
4. Proportionate size of lower and upper divisions in the State colleges and in the University.
5. Study of State and institutional scholarships.

An appendix, dealing with the selection and retention of junior college students, summarizes questionnaire responses from 56 of the 63 junior colleges operating in California in 1959.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

#5-2
#7366
HE7366

Selection and Retention of Students in California's Institutions of Higher Education

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED000028

[redacted]

SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA'S INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Prepared for the Master Plan Survey Team and the
Liaison Committee of The Regents of the University
of California and the State Board of Education

by the

Technical Committee on
Selection and Retention of Students

Herman A. Spindt, Chairman
Ralph Prator
J. Edward Sanders
Basil H. Peterson
Grant W. Jensen

with the assistance of

Edward W. Bowes
Dorothy M. Knoell

Frances Sybenga, Secretary

Liaison Committee

William L. Blair
Raymond J. Daba
Mabel E. Kinney
Wilber D. Simons
Roy E. Simpson
Gerald H. Hagar
Cornelius J. Haggerty
Clark Kerr
Donald H. McLaughlin
Jesse H. Steinhart

Master Plan Survey Team

Arthur G. Coons, Chairman
Arthur D. Browne
Howard A. Campion
Glenn S. Dumke
Thomas C. Holy
Dean E. McHenry
Henry T. Tyler
Robert J. Wert

Published by

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Sacramento, 1961

TO

DR. HERMAN A. SPINDT
(January 9, 1893 - March 19, 1960)

Who gave 43 years of his life in the service of
education, and who even with failing strength
sought to complete this assignment,

THIS REPORT IS GRATEFULLY DEDICATED

January 6, 1960

Dr. Arthur G. Coons
Chairman, Master Plan Survey Team and
President, Occidental College
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles 41, California

Dear Dr. Coons:

In accordance with the action of the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California on July 8, 1959, in approving the appointment of a representative committee to study the problems of selection and retention of students in California public and private institutions of higher education, and your subsequent letter outlining the scope of the committee's responsibility, we have prepared and now transmit our final report entitled "Selection and Retention of Students." In the preparation of this report we have endeavored to follow the suggestions on format, organization, headings, length of report and the like, as contained in the August 17, September 18, and December 1 memoranda from your office.

We wish to express appreciation for the help given the Committee by the two consultants, Dorothy M. Knoell of the State Department of Education and Edward W. Bowes, Assistant Director of Relations with Schools at the University of California.

Very cordially yours,

HERMAN A. SPINDT, Chairman
Technical Committee on Selection
and Retention of Students

RALPH PRATOR

BASIL H. PETERSON

J. EDWARD SANDERS

GRANT JENSEN

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-- NOT FILMED

CONTENTS

Section

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Proportion of California Students Attending College in California 2

Opportunities for College Study in California in Comparison with Other States 3

II. MEASURES OF THE VALIDITY OF ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS 5

Scholastic Success in First Semester or Year 6

Continuance in School 7

(In Summary, Reports by Grace V. Bird). 9

Dismissals Due to Poor Scholarship 13

Comparative Tests 13

III. ADMISSION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 18

Junior Colleges 18
  Trends in Admission Policies and Procedures 18
  Admission Standards for Beginning Freshman Students 18
  Admission of Students from Other Colleges 20
  Admission Standards for Certain Courses or Curricula. 20

State Colleges 21
  Historical Development of Undergraduate Admission Requirements in the State Colleges. 21
  Summary 23
  Admission to Freshman Standing. 23
  Analysis of Freshman Enrollments. 24
  Quality of Entering Freshmen 28
  Performance of Entering Freshmen. 31
  Probability of Disqualification 33

University of California 36
  Historical Development of Undergraduate Admission Requirements in the University of California. 36
  Admission to Freshman Standing. 38
  Admission with Advanced Standing. 41

California Independent Colleges and Universities. 44

IV. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN RETENTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS 46

Junior Colleges 46
  Classification of Students. 46

Retention of Students 46

State Colleges 49
Policies on Probation and Disqualification 49

University of California 50
Probation and Dismissal 50

Independent Colleges 53

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 54

Basic Assumptions in Regard to Selection, Retention, and Enrollment Limitations 54

Improvement in Admission or Selection Procedures 55
Admission to the Junior Colleges 55
Applicants Eligible to Freshman Standing in the State Colleges and University of California 56
Applicants Ineligible for Admission to Freshman Standing in the State Colleges and University 56
Admission at the Junior Level 57
Credit for Junior College Courses 57
Admission of Limited and Special Students 58
Special Requirements for Out-of-state Students 58
Need for Continued Study of Procedures 59

Classification, Probation, and Dismissal Policies 59
Classification and Retention in the Junior Colleges 59
Probation and Dismissal in the University and State Colleges 60

Relative Sizes of Lower and Upper Divisions in the State Colleges and the University of California 60
Policies and Procedures for Compulsory Limitation 61
Comments on the Foregoing Suggestions 63

Study of Institutional and State Scholarships 66

APPENDIX. SELECTION AND RETENTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS 69

Participation 69

Admission Standards for Beginning Freshmen Students 69

Admission of Students from Other Colleges 70

Retention of Students 71

Graduation Standards 76

Selection of Students 77

Holding Power 78

TABLES

Table		Page
1	Persistence and Bachelor Degree Record of Students Entering the University as Freshmen in the Fall of 1948, 1949, and 1951 (In summary reports by Miss Bird)	10
2	Withdrawal Record of Students Entering the University as Freshmen in the Fall of 1948, 1949, and 1951 (In summary reports by Miss Bird)	11
3	Persistence and Degree Record of Junior College Transfers Entering the University as Juniors in Fall, 1953, Berkeley and Los Angeles (In summary reports by Miss Bird)	12
4	Analysis of Freshman Enrollments in the California State Colleges, Fall of 1958	25
5	Basis for Admission of First-Time Freshmen to the California State Colleges, Fall of 1957 and 1958	26
6	New, First-Time Freshman Enrollment Trends in Selected State Colleges By Years, 1952 Through 1958	27
7	High School Recommending Units for Freshmen Admitted to Nine State Colleges, Fall of 1958	29
8	Aptitude Test Percentile Ranges for Freshmen Admitted to Nine State Colleges, Fall of 1958	29
9	Per Cent Relation of Aptitude Test Percentile Scores and High School Recommending Units of Freshmen Admitted to Nine State Colleges, Fall of 1958	30
10	Recommending Units and Aptitude Test Scores Earned by Fall 1958 State College Freshmen with Cumulative First-Year Grade-Point Averages Below "C" (Men and Women)	32
11	Probability of Disqualification, Based on Recommending Units of Freshmen Admitted to the State Colleges, Fall of 1958	34
12	Probability of Disqualification, Based on Aptitude Test Scores of Freshmen Admitted to the State Colleges, Fall of 1958	34
13	Probability of Disqualification, Based on Recommending Units and Test Scores of Entering Freshmen Admitted to the State Colleges, Fall of 1958	35
14	Number of Freshmen Admitted and Registered Under Regular and Alternate Plans of Admission, by Campus of the University of California, 1952-56, and the Over-All Per Cent Distribution by Plan for 1957-58	37

15 Median Grade-point Averages on Subjects of Required Pattern Completed in High School, and Median Grade-point Averages in First Semester's Work and Per Cent Below "C" in the First Semester in the University of California, 1952 Through 1957 40

16 New Registered Undergraduate Student Transfers to the State Colleges by Level and Type of Institution of Origin, 1956-57 . . . 41

17 New Registered Undergraduate Student Transfers to the University of California by Level and Type of Institution of Origin, 1956-1957. 42

18 Undergraduate Dismissals in Relation to Total Undergraduate Enrollments by Colleges and Schools on the Berkeley Campus of the University of California--by Years 1956, 1957, and 1958 52

19 Per Cent Dismissals Within Each Class, Berkeley Campus, University of California, 1957-58 52

Section I

INTRODUCTION

Discussion of the problems of selection and retention in the public institutions of higher learning of a state must be framed within the existing situation. Population trends, economic capabilities, vested and emergent interests, and existing facilities and philosophies of higher education, as well as present methods of student evaluation and selection, all combine to structure the situation and delimit the area of investigation and discussion. The following description of the present system of higher education in California contained in the February, 1959, publication of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education entitled Selecting Students for Western Colleges and Universities[1] serves as an appropriate introduction to this report.

The California System

> One approach is illustrated by developments in California. As compared with other Western states, California has an extremely large population with a rapid rate of growth. It has many truly urban centers, large numbers of middle-sized communities, and relatively few sparsely-populated areas. Its industry and small business are highly developed, and help to provide a variety of strong tax bases for public expenditures. At the same time, the state must have a continuous and increasing stream of well-trained technicians and professional people to serve the needs of its growing population and economy.
>
> The educational system which is to meet the needs of this complex state must have a high level of both quality and diversity, and this can be built upon a relatively strong base of financial support. The pattern which has developed includes (1) a strong university system, with several campuses and high standards for admission; (2) a group of state colleges, which emphasize both academic and technological disciplines, and have less stringent admission requirements; and (3) numerous community junior colleges, providing convenient preparatory programs for a wide range of student abilities.
>
> In this pattern the university consciously attempts to excel in teaching, and especially in research. Its faculty is a distinguished one, its admission standards high in the scale of academic aptitude and preparation, and its standards of student performance rigorous. It is designed to produce the most highly-trained scientists, teachers, scholars, advanced technologists, and professional personnel in the state. Graduate research and teaching are an integral part of its programs. Increasingly, the university system is stressing graduate work, and work at the junior and senior level.

---

[1] Selecting Students for Western Colleges and Universities. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado, February, 1959.

The state colleges in this system are strong four-year institutions, but they recognize the quality limitations of trying to do many jobs at once. They incorporate a broad mixture of academic, scientific, and technical programs which will meet the state's needs for college-trained and educated people. By agreement with the university, the state colleges emphasize undergraduate teaching over research and graduate study, but provide solid groundwork for talented students who wish to go on to graduate school. Graduate programs in special areas of strength are offered but no effort is made to have strong graduate programs "across the board" in each of the state colleges. Admission standards are more generous, to fit the broader role assigned to the colleges.

Junior colleges have been established in as many different communities as can economically support them, including urban centers where universities or state colleges also are located. Relatively inexpensive and convenient for local students, these two-year community colleges look to local sources of funds as well as to the state. They function to meet a variety of community needs: a two-year trial period for students who could not enter a university or state college immediately, for financial or academic reasons; a two-year liberal education program for some; and a multitude of vocational, avocational, and cultural offerings desired by local residents. Their generous admission policies, low tuition, geographical convenience, and sensitivity to immediate community wishes thus serve to relieve pressure for the state colleges and universities to be all things to all men.

A system such as this allows a coherent approach to a student admission-retention policy. It makes practical a policy of selecting for ability to perform at the tasks assigned, while at the same time providing alternative kinds and levels of educational opportunities, which students with varying aptitudes can try.

Proportion of California Students Attending College in California

Of 294,465 California residents enrolled in colleges and universities in the fall of 1958, 274,102 (93 per cent) were registered in California colleges, and 20,363 (7 per cent) in colleges of other states. Of 305,231 students registered in all California colleges, 6,841 (2.2 per cent) were residents of foreign countries, and 22,288 (6 per cent) were residents of other parts of the United States.[2] In the California state colleges only 4 per cent are nonresidents. These figures indicate that California is not carrying an undue burden of collegiate level education for other states.

---

[2] Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Higher Education in the West, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, June 1959, page 6.

Opportunities for College Study in California in Comparison with Other States

Comparisons among states in this regard are complicated by the fact that available data are based on the 1950 census and are largely obsolete. Data are also fragmentary to the degree that comparisons of enrollments fail to indicate that those continuing their education are those most fitted to do so. It would appear that California ranks in the top four or five states in terms of the proportion of high school student graduates who continue their education. Some of the more cynical may contend that such a high comparative standing is undesirable and that too large a proportion of the state's population is being schooled to a level above its real potentialities. The Committee cannot agree with this viewpoint, primarily for the following two reasons:

1. The beginning age of regular employment has gone steadily upward since 1910, and consequently the probability of regular employment for the eighteen-nineteen year-old youth is much less than in the past. Further, the types of industry and agriculture that are developing in California want the employee with more schooling rather than less.

2. The instruments (i.e., scholastic records and tests) by which decision on who should or should not go on with post-high school study have not reached that point of reliability which would justify a policy of arbitrary exclusion of a fixed proportion from college on any basis other than performance in some college.

The Committee attempted to make some direct comparisons with a few states which, because of location or similarity of situation, might be indicative of opportunity for college education comparable with that of California. The information that follows was secured from these states through personal correspondence by the Committee chairman.

Michigan

1. Applicants who have less than a "C" average in high school may have difficulty in being admitted to any college.

2. Fees are charged by the junior colleges; the range of fees is from $20.00 to $200.00 per year; the median fee is $160.00 per year.

3. The range of per cent of high school graduates eligible for admission to four-year colleges and universities is greater than in California, largely because admission requirements are not specific but depend heavily on principals' recommendations.

4. In California only a very small proportion of students come from other states; Michigan institutions carry a much heavier proportion. For example, of the 3,081 freshmen enrolled at the University of Michigan in the fall of 1958, 1,124 (36 per cent) came from other states even though out-of-state applicants are held for higher requirements than in-state applicants.

Oregon

1. No junior colleges.

2. Admission granted on "C" average in high school subjects, on a standing above the fortieth percentile on a college aptitude test, or by "exception to the rules."

Washington

1. Admission to the University of Washington is based on "C" average. Other four-year public institutions (i.e., Washington State University and the colleges of education) may be somewhat more liberal.

2. The junior college system does not cover the state as well as the junior colleges of California do. Fees are charged: the range is from $90.00 to $145.00 per year; the median fee is $123.00 per year.

The Committee is of the belief that the California high school graduate has no more barriers to continuance of his schooling at the college level than the student of any other state, because all high school graduates may be admitted to the junior colleges, and at least two years of college work may be pursued without tuition cost. The Committee regards free tuition in the state's junior colleges as one of the real strengths of the California system of higher education. Furthermore, subsequent admission to third and fourth year work in a state college or campus of the University is open to any really deserving student, with continued schooling at a cost well below the median costs in other states.

The fundamental alternatives in answering the question of whether or not the state should furnish free instruction at the college level derive from one's beliefs on education — is it primarily for the welfare and profit of individuals, or is it primarily for the benefit of society? The Committee is strongly of the opinion that instruction at all levels is primarily for the benefit of society and that no individual should be denied educational opportunity because of the economic status of his family; neither should his chance for schooling be delayed by the necessity of paying tuition. His value to society, in terms of years of productive service, requires early and regular schooling to the extent of his abilities and willingness to take advantage of the state's opportunities for education beyond the high school.

Section II

MEASURES OF THE VALIDITY OF ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Admission requirements are valid for any one college if, first, they serve to qualify for admission those applicants whose educational purposes are properly met by the college and whose abilities and preparation indicate probable scholastic success in the college; and, secondly, they serve to eliminate applicants not meeting the two criteria above.

It is probably not possible for American colleges to judge entrance requirements strictly from the viewpoint of the validity of those requirements. College entrance requirements have effects on other schools and society in general that must be taken into consideration. Ralph Prator, President of San Fernando Valley State College and a member of this Committee, has prepared a statement that points out some of these related effects, which should be considered in the establishment of admission criteria. The statement follows:

A PROPOSED STATEMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINATION OF ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS[1]

> Admission requirements often reflect more realistically the objectives of the college than does its statement of aims and purposes. Although these requirements should clearly bear the stamp of the special programs and needs of the college, they ought to permit a wide latitude of interpretation in their administration.
>
> Admission requirements to colleges and universities have a considerable influence on the course of studies of the secondary schools. It is, therefore, suggested that the interests of both the high schools and the junior colleges be borne in mind when decisions are reached with respect to admission requirements. Developmental changes in admissions policy should bear upon the curriculum of the secondary schools in a constructive manner.
>
> These are some suggested guidelines for the development of admissions standards:
>
> 1. Objective study of existing practices and procedures in the admissions program should be continuous.
>
> 2. Standards and criteria for admissions should genuinely reflect the purposes and mission of the college.

---

[1] Prepared by Ralph Prator, President, San Fernando Valley State College, and member of Technical Committee on Selection and Retention of Students.

3. The concept of admission policy and requirements should give adequate consideration to the improvement of learning experiences in the high schools and junior colleges.

4. Since general education is an accepted objective of each college, admission requirements should reflect the continuous mastery of those knowledges and skills required for the common life.

5. A variety of ways by which a student may qualify for admission should be provided for in the admissions plan, and provision also should be made for critical study of the success of each criterion or combination of criteria for admission to the college.

6. Despite our entering upon an era of mass education marked by intense competition among candidates for the limited places in our colleges, any admissions plan must give full consideration to the factor of individual differences and the special needs of the individual student.

American colleges are not consistent in their adherence to these principles. On the one hand, there are many state universities that maintain a very liberal policy in the belief that every high school graduate should have a chance to prove himself at the university level. At the other extreme is the private college with selective procedures that qualify for admission only a very small number of those whose educational purposes would be met by the college and who have abilities that would permit scholastic success. Between these two extremes of admission practices are efforts by other institutions to get a widespread geographical representation, to get student leaders, to serve primarily a single church group, to keep the dormitories filled, and to keep a balanced student body as between the sexes or in regard to student activities such as athletics, speech, drama, and musical performance. To select those who are probably able to achieve scholastic success, colleges use various procedures such as rank in class, grades in high school or college subjects, personal recommendation, school recommendations, aptitude tests, achievement tests, personality tests, extracurricular activities or other evidence of leadership, and educational level previously achieved -- that is, graduation from high school, graduation from junior college, achievement of junior standing, bachelor's degree, and the like.

Scholastic Success in First Semester or Year

Validity studies of admissions requirements have taken several directions in the past. The criterion most commonly used is scholastic success in the first semester or first year. This particular measure is open to at least two criticisms: first, that the first semester or year sometimes calls for such extreme personal adjustment that it is not a fair measure of the probability of eventual scholastic success; and second, that the program of the first two years in most colleges is of a "general education" nature, as distinguished from the "major" emphasis in the last two years. This second point is somewhat borne out by the fact that grades earned by juniors and seniors generally are higher than grades earned by freshmen and sophomores, although presumably the competition for grades should be keener at the higher level.

Continuance in School

Another measure of the validity of entrance requirements is persistence in school. Studies relating to this type of measurement take two directions: first, persistence from the date of entrance; and second, a "working backward," or an analysis of the characteristics of those who have persisted to graduation. Persistence toward a degree is, in the minds of the Committee, a very questionable measure of the effectiveness of admissions standards since a high proportion of students who withdraw from public institutions do so in good scholastic standing. In a paper prepared for a conference of admissions officers at De Pauw University, Spindt[2] reported on persistence to a degree or toward a degree as a measure of the validity of admissions criteria:

> In addition to the first-semester grade point average as a criterion of academic success, persistence to a degree or toward a degree has been suggested as a good independent or supplementary measure. The reports on persistence, however, are not extensive enough to qualify it as an independent measure, and only very roughly as a supplementary measure. The Office of Relations with Schools, University of California, reports markedly higher persistence of junior college transfers among those with good high school scholarship than among those with poor high school scholarship.[3] (A "B" average on academic courses was used as the dividing line for good and poor high school scholarship). However, a reasonably high proportion of the two groups — 49 per cent of the first, 40 per cent of the second — were in satisfactory scholarship standing at the time of withdrawal.
>
> Seyler reports that for the students in the highest quarter of the high school graduating class entering the University of Illinois in September, 1950, 56.4 per cent had earned bachelor's degrees before September, 1955, 31.66 per cent of those in the second quarter, 17.05 per cent of those in the third quarter, and only 8.24 per cent of those in the lowest quarter. It should be noted that from 4.59 per cent of the highest quarter to 7.65 per cent of the lowest quarter were still registered in the fall of 1955. The honors records were fully as striking, with 21.62 per cent of the top quarter, 6.67 per cent of the second quarter, and none of the lower half. The same story appears in the probation list, but of course, in reverse — 32.32 per cent, 54.87 per cent, 72.88 per cent, 78.57 per cent. The scholastic standing of drop-outs, however, raises serious questions as to the use of persistence as anything other than a supplementary requirement -- in each of the four groups the numbers withdrawing while in good scholastic standing are respectively 262 out of 433, 139 out of 375, 62 out of 267, and 39 out of 143.[4] Approximately the same value may be gained from the honors list or the probation list, without using the withdrawal list at all.

---

[2] Herman A. Spindt, "The Future of Admissions," typescript, July, 1959.

[3] Office of Relations with Schools, University of California, A Comparison of the Persistence, Academic Performance, and Bachelors' Degrees Earned by Native Students and Junior College Transfers Entering the University of California as Juniors, Fall, 1953, Berkeley and Los Angeles, mimeo, 1957.

[4] E. C. Seyler, A Study of the Entering Freshman Class of September, 1950, Office of Admissions and Records, University of Illinois, mimeo, 1955.

Persistence of a different type is shown in certain studies in the postwar period at the University of California. Students admitted to freshman standing under regular rules showed a 4 per cent to 6 per cent withdrawal during the first semester, while veterans admitted with deficiencies showed from 8 per cent to 21 per cent. Nonveterans admitted under regular advanced standing rules showed from 5 per cent to 8 per cent withdrawals in the first semester, veterans regularly admitted 7 per cent, and veterans admitted with deficiencies from 9 per cent to 12 per cent. These figures, together with poor scholarship records and low correlations of previous scholarship and performance in the University, led directly to a limitation of the conditions under which veterans could be admitted with deficiencies.[5]

The first-semester withdrawals at the University of California in the years 1952-56 for freshmen regularly admitted added up to a total of 2.5 per cent, and for those admitted as exceptions to the rules, 6 per cent; for junior college transfers the corresponding figures are 5 per cent and 8 per cent.[6]

Iffert reports a heavy proportion of withdrawals for purpose of transfer to other colleges attributable to dissatisfaction with the first college or to change of curricular purpose. This is borne out by studies at Syracuse University. Iffert further gives considerable weight to family income, especially at the freshman and sophomore levels, to high school scholastic standing, to college placement tests, and to college grades.[7]

Registrar's reports at the University of California for the year 1957-58 showed continuing students as 19 per cent below a "C" average, 81 per cent above; withdrawals showed 35 per cent below a "C" average in their first semester, 65 per cent above; of the withdrawals who had completed more than one semester, 34 per cent were below a "C", 66 per cent above a "C".[8]

---

[5] Office of Admissions, University of California, Comparative Scholarship in Institution Previously Attended and First Semester in the University, 1946-48, photostat, 1948.

[6] Office of Admissions, University of California, Comparative Scholarship in Institution Previously Attended and First Semester in the University, 1952-56.

[7] Robert E. Iffert, "Drop-outs: Nature and Causes; Effects on Students, Family, and Society." Current Issues in Higher Education, Proceedings of the 11th National Conference on Higher Education, 1956.

[8] Office of the Registrar, Berkeley: University of California October, 1958. "A Study of the Academic Characteristics of Those Students Who Withdrew and Who Were Dismissed During the Year 1957-58. (mimeographed).

> This cursory review of the academic status of students at the time of withdrawal leads to the conclusion that, so many factors other than academic success being involved, the use of probability of withdrawal would be rather dangerous as a basis for exclusion from or admission to a college. However, a method of admission that shows an excessive percentage of withdrawals for reasons of academic failure should be carefully studied by the college with a view to desirable adjustment. The problem of objective study is complicated by the difficulty of getting at the real reason for withdrawal as compared with the apparent or assigned reason.

The conclusions reached by Spindt in his report are substantiated by two reports[9,10] prepared by Grace Bird, Associate Director of Relations with Schools, University of California, on matters of retention and withdrawal. A summary of these reports would normally be included in the section on retention policies; the Committee believes, however, that its greatest value to the Master Plan Survey Team is in relation to validity of entrance requirements and, consequently, is included here. The summary, compiled by Miss Bird from her two reports, follows:

> The data presented in this memorandum are selected from studies made of three separate classes of freshmen entering the University by one of the regular methods of admission: Fall, 1948; Fall, 1949; and Fall, 1951. The studies inquired into persistence, performance, bachelor degrees earned, withdrawal and academic status at withdrawal. The first two classes were studied for the four general campuses of the University then operating. The third class was studied only for the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses.

---

[9] Grace V. Bird, "The Native Student Study: An Inquiry into the Persistence and Achievement of Two Complete Classes Entering the University of California Directly from California High Schools." Office of Relations with Schools. Berkeley: University of California, 1955.

[10] "A Comparison of the Persistence, Academic Performance, and Bachelor Degrees Earned by Native Students and Junior College Transfers Entering the University of California as Juniors, Fall, 1953, Berkeley and Los Angeles." Office of Relations with Schools. Berkeley: University of California, September 26, 1957.

Retention Record of Students Entering the University of California as Beginning Freshmen

Table 1 shows that 55 per cent of the students entering the University as freshmen are in attendance eight semesters later or have earned their degree earlier. The per cent persisting at Berkeley is about 7 per cent greater than on the other campuses. The lower half of Table 1 indicates the per cent of original entrants earning degrees at specified times after entrance as beginning freshmen. For the one class for which data were assembled for all campuses, 35 per cent had earned degrees eight semesters after the original semester.

TABLE 1

Persistence and Bachelor Degree Record of Students Entering the University as Freshmen in the Fall of 1948, 1949, and 1951

Persistence record for certain terms	Data from studies of freshmen entering in the fall of:							
	1948			1949			1951	
	All UC	Berk. only	LA only	All UC	Berk. only	LA only	Berk. only	LA only
Number of entering freshmen	2,921	1,462	1,109	2,817	1,435	1,040	1,462	1,069
Per cent of entering freshmen in attendance for:				(Per Cent)				
8 consecutive semesters or earned degree earlier	42.8	47.6	41.7	43.7	48.1	42.5	47.1	44.0
Re-entrants - in attendance during eighth semester	8.3	10.0	7.0	6.9	6.8	8.4	5.3	5.9
Transfers within UC attending eighth semester	4.5	4.5	3.2	4.0	4.7	2.5	5.3	0.7
Total	55.6	62.1	51.9	54.6	59.6	53.4	57.7	50.6
Per cent of entering freshmen earning bachelor's degrees at the end of:				(Per Cent)				
Eighth consecutive semester or before				34.6	40.3	29.7	35.6	27.6
Ninth consecutive semester				6.4	5.8	8.0	11.0	15.1
Tenth consecutive semester				No data	No data	No data	5.4	4.2
Eleventh consecutive semester				No data	No data	No data	2.5	1.9
Total				41.0	46.1	37.7	54.5	48.8

Withdrawal Record of Students Entering the University of California as Beginning Freshmen

Magnitude

Table 2 shows that about 45 per cent of the freshman entrants to the University withdraw before completing the eighth semester following admission. About four-fifths of these withdraw before entering their junior year. Detailed information on withdrawals semester by semester is available in the files of the Berkeley Office of Relations with Schools.

TABLE 2

Withdrawal Record of Students Entering the University as Freshmen in the Fall of 1948, 1949, and 1951

Withdrawal record	Data from studies of freshmen entering in the fall of:							
	1948			1949			1951	
	All UC	Berk. only	LA only	All UC	Berk. only	LA only	Berk. only	LA only
Number of entering freshmen	2,921	1,462	1,109	2,817	1,435	1,040	1,462	1,069
	(Per Cent)							
Per cent of entering freshmen withdrawing before the fifth semester	46.2	40.8	47.9	46.9	41.1	48.8	36.8	44.3
Per cent of entering freshmen withdrawing during upper division	12.9	13.0	12.8	11.1	13.0	9.9	16.1	11.6
Gross withdrawal	59.1	53.8	60.7	58.0	54.1	58.7	52.9	55.9
Less per cent of students receiving early degrees, re-entrants, intra-UC transfers	-14.7	-15.9	-12.6	-12.7	-13.7	-12.1	-10.7	-7.4
Net withdrawal	44.4	37.9	48.1	45.4	40.4	46.6	42.2	48.5

Academic Standing at Withdrawal

More than half the fall, 1951, entrants withdrawing from Berkeley before entering the fourth semester (54 per cent) had cumulative grade-point averages of "C" or higher. However, 34 per cent of the withdrawals by this time were in serious academic difficulties with grade-point deficiencies of six or more. Withdrawals thereafter were maintaining "C" averages or higher in 70 per cent of the cases while 21 per cent showed grade-point shortages of six or more. The "All UC" data for fall, 1948, and fall, 1949, differ very little from those cited for Berkeley. In summary, it can be said that about one-third of all withdrawals are below a "C" average at the time of withdrawal.

The high school grade-point average of students who withdrew with University averages below "C" was close to two-tenths of a grade-point below that of student withdrawals above a "C" average at the time of withdrawal.

Classification of Withdrawals by Sex

More women students withdraw than men. The class entering in fall, 1949, showed that at Berkeley 47.8 per cent of the original freshman men entrants withdrew before entering their eighth semester and 56.2 per cent of the freshman women entrants. At Los Angeles the per cents were 48.4 per cent of the original men entrants and 64.3 per cent of the original women entrants.

Retention and Withdrawal Record of California Junior College Transfers to the University of California

The junior college transfers represented in Table 3 were those entering the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses in fall, 1953, with 60 or more units or with a few less than 60 units if it was known they entered with junior standing.

TABLE 3

Persistence and Degree Record of Junior College Transfers Entering the University as Juniors in Fall, 1953, Berkeley and Los Angeles

Persistence Record	Berkeley		Los Angeles	
	Eligible at h.s. grad.	Ineligible at h.s. grad.	Eligible at h.s. grad.	Ineligible at h.s. grad.
Number of junior college transfers in fall term, 1953:	184	213	141	288
	(Per Cent)			
Per cent in attendance through fourth upper division semester[1]:	81.0	60.0	67.4	66.7
Per cent withdrawing during upper division:	19.0	40.0	32.6	33.3
	(Per Cent)			
Per cent achieving earned degrees by:				
June, 1955	57.1	35.2	27.7	26.4
January, 1956	12.5	9.8	22.0	20.1
June, 1956	5.4	6.1	8.5	10.4
January, 1957	1.1	3.3	2.1	3.5
Total	76.1	54.4	60.3	60.4

---

[1] Includes transfers to SF Medical Center, re-entrants, and those receiving early degrees.

The per cent of junior college withdrawals with cumulative University grade-point averages of "C" or above was 49 per cent at Berkeley and 55 per cent at Los Angeles for transfers eligible for admission to the University at high school graduation, and 36 per cent at Berkeley and 40 per cent at Los Angeles for the transfers ineligible for the University at the time of high school graduation.

Dismissals Due to Poor Scholarship

A third measure of validity of entrance requirements is closely related to the second; namely, the proportion of dismissals from the college because of poor scholastic performance. Weaknesses of this measure are lack of consistency as to grading standards, different rules for dismissal, and variations in the administration of those rules. On the Berkeley campus of the University of California, the per cent of dismissals following the spring term of 1958 was 1.9 in the College of Architecture, 2.0 in the College of Agriculture, 3.5 in the School of Business Administration, 4.7 in the College of Letters and Science, 6.6 in the College of Engineering, and 10.8 in the College of Chemistry. (Detailed information on the relation of admission requirements and failures in the state colleges is in the state college part of Section III.)

Comparative Tests

A fourth measure of the validity of entrance requirements is the comparative standing on objective tests of those admitted or rejected. The value of this measure varies in accordance with the type of curriculum followed in the college. In highly specialized curricula in which very specific skills or knowledge are required, the objective test may be as good a measure of probable scholastic success as the previous scholastic record, or even a better one. Examples of this may be found in engineering, clinical work in the College of Dentistry, and the like. On the other hand, in curricula calling for more generalized skills or knowledge, the objective test has not proved itself to be as good a predictor as the previous scholastic record. This fact seems to be increasingly true the higher the level attained: that is, the aptitude test seems to be more predictive of college scholastic success at the freshman level than at the junior or the graduate level. To this fact of lower validity than previous scholastic record, on the part of the objective test, must be added the dangers of misinterpretation, particularly those associated with the norms on which standing is determined. To be useful in guidance within the institution, the norms used should be those of the institution itself.

In the opinion of the Committee, persistence to or toward a degree and the per cent of dismissals are valuable supplementary measures of the validity of entrance requirements only if withdrawals or dismissals become excessively high. Properly compared, the objective test is a better measure of the quality of the students admitted to a college than either the withdrawal or the dismissal measure. Measured by correlations with instructors' grades in college, however, the objective test is not as good a measure of the quality of an admitted class as is the scholastic record of the first semester or first year. According to the evidence at hand, the best single measure of the validity of entrance requirements is the scholastic record made by the student in his first semester or first year of attendance in his new school.

One of the most difficult problems in testing the validity of entrance requirements is to give proper weight to each component in the requirements of a college. This can be done by proper statistical procedures if a quantitative value can be given to each component, but it is very difficult to give quantitative value to each component part in a set of entrance requirements. The University of California bases its requirements on average scholarship (easily described quantitatively by a grade-point average) in a pattern of ten academic subjects in the high school program. On the other hand, the state colleges make no subject prescription, and the scholastic requirement is expressed in terms of number of units of "A" or "B" grade. The problem then is to find a procedure that will isolate the value of subject prescription as opposed to no subject prescription. When the validity of the requirements for admission to the University and the state colleges is considered, exactly the same problem occurs in admission to advanced standing — the University limits severely the courses on which admission is based; the state colleges accept many courses that the University will not accept.

In both these methods of admission, the quality component (i.e., the grade-point average or number of academic units) can be expressed quantitatively and can therefore be easily used in statistical comparison. The prescription of subject component can be measured, seemingly, only by considerations somewhat outside direct statistical comparison. Of such considerations, the following two seem to have validity:

1. Is the distribution of grades in academic and nonacademic courses spread in ways that give real information as to which students are superior and which inferior, or is the grading in one type of subject so much more lenient that discrimination becomes difficult?

2. Whether or not grading standards in the two types of subjects are alike, the predictive value of grades in each type may be studied through correlation techniques. To be valid in judging entrance requirements, however, such correlation studies must keep the intelligence component constant and must take into consideration the nature of the college program at both the freshman and the upper division level — what is true of the academic program at the University may not be true of the occupational program at California State Polytechnic College. Further, grading standards within each institution vary greatly in different departments.

Distribution of grades in academic and nonacademic courses in high schools and junior colleges tends to be very nearly the same, with the exception of instrumental and vocal music, graphic arts, and men's physical education. However, the scholastic abilities of students in the vocational training classes tends to be lower than the similar abilities of students in academic classes, as measured by tests of academic aptitude.

To the degree that the general scholastic quality of students is lower in nonacademic courses than in academic courses, the grades in nonacademic courses tend to lose their value in an entrance procedure aimed at securing the better academic student. The tendency toward easy grading in instrumental and vocal music becomes of special importance in a system of admission from high school which gives equal value to grades in music performance courses and grades in academic-type subjects.

A summary of studies[11] of the relationship of high school scholarship, as measured by rank in class or average scholarship in academic subjects and/or test standing, with scholarship in college justifies the following conclusions, with certain cautions following each conclusion:

---

[11] Joseph P. Cosand, "Admission Criteria," College and University, XXVIII (April 1953).

1. Correlations of academic success in high school with first semester academic success in college, as measured by grade-point average, yield reasonably consistent coefficients from .45 to .55.

    a. Rank-in-class may be a dangerous measure of high school academic success. Variation in general intelligence level, and any sizeable amount of nonacademic courses in the records of individual students, and a high proportion of retention of students in high school (as is true in California), will temper class ranking as a basis for judgment.

    b. There is little evidence of the comparative predictive value of grades in academic subjects and grades in noracademic subjects. Such evidence as is available indicates greater predictive value in academic subject grades for performance in academic-type colleges.

    c. Specific subject grades sometimes predict specific academic successes or failures better than rank-in-class or average grades do. This prediction seems to be true, however, only in the fields where preliminary courses are prerequisite, or at least introductory to college courses (e.g., mathematics for physical science, or mathematics for advanced mathematics courses). It does not seem to be true, at least in the same degree, in the humanities and social sciences.

2. Single tests, whether of the aptitude or achievement type, generally correlate .3 to .4 with first semester grade-point average in college. Two exceptions should be noted: first, if tests can be specifically related to the material that must be mastered in a college course, correlation may be higher, .5 to .6 (such tests seem to be especially valuable in the exact disciplines: mathematics, physical science, and some phases of engineering); second, if college grades (i.e., the criterion) are based on examinations prepared by a control office (University of Chicago[12]; Navy V-12 Program at Yale[13]) rather than on grades given by instructors, the correlations will be markedly higher, .7 or better.

    a. One of the most serious problems in the use of tests for admission purposes is that involving the security of the test. Closely associated are the problems of uniformity of administration, reporting scores quickly and accurately, widespread and frequent availability, necessary revision of the tests, and research leading to improvement.

    b. Although previous scholastic record shows a significantly higher correlation with first semester scholastic record than does standing on tests, there is on the part of parents and students, and sometimes college and university people, a much greater faith that the test tells the truth about a student more exactly than does the scholastic record. Admissions officers recognize and use the scholastic record in statistical prediction, but frequently they use test scores to convince unsuccessful applicants that they should go to some other college. Unfortunately, descriptions of freshman classes that are now somewhat the vogue seem to be given largely in terms of test scores rather than high school achievement.

---

[12] Joseph P. Cosand, Ibid.

[13] A. B. Crawford and P. S. Burnham, "Educational Testing in the Navy V-12 Program at Yale," Psychology Bulletin, XLII (May, 1945), 301-9.

3. The combination of previous scholastic record and test scores, whether of the subject achievement or aptitude type, adds comparatively little to correlations of the previous scholastic record with first semester grade-point average in college. The improvement is of the magnitude of .05 to .10 or from correlations of .45 to .55 previously cited to those of .50 to .65.

   a. The caution cited previously in regard to taste of a specific character must be borne in mind.

   b. The problem admissions officers face is that of the weight to be given to tests in comparison with previous scholastic record. Recommendations vary from 1/3 to 1/10; as a practical matter, the Committee's observation is that tests tend to weigh much more heavily than this in any admissions procedure that involves a personal interview.

4. In the face of poor scholastic performance in high school, tests, whether of the aptitude or achievement type, are poor predictors of academic success.[14] However, the college that is willing to "take a chance" may get a few very superior students on the basis of tests alone — highly capable students who are able to overcome the poor habits that characterize their past work.

5. At the present time, there are no measures of personality, interest, and motivation which are operationally useful.

6. Most of the studies of academic success have dealt only with entering freshman students, and it may be asked if the problem of prediction of academic success is different for students entering with advanced standing. There is, of course, much less information about prediction for the advanced standing group, but studies at the University of California indicate higher correlations with previous scholastic records than is true at the freshman level and, except in specialized fields, very little additional correlation from the use of tests.[15]

---

[14] A study of students at the University of California whose academic achievement in high school was below a "B" average in required academic subjects, but who had average scores on the College Entrance Examination Board Scholastic Aptitude Test and Achievement Tests above the median of the entering freshman class showed correlations of only .17 with first semester grades in the University.

[15] "Problems of University Admission in a Period of Heavy Enrollment." Office of Admissions. Berkeley: University of California (mimeographed), 1954. See also "Comparative Scholarship in Institution Previously Attended and First Semester in the University of California, 1948-52" (photostat), 1952.

> In 1950, the College Entrance Examination Board developed experimentally a combination of aptitude and achievement tests to be administered at the junior level. The proficiency tests included the fields of social sciences, humanities, life sciences, physical sciences, and mathematics, of which each student would take two. In May, 1951, 833 students admitted to junior standing at the University of California, Los Angeles, of which approximately one-third were transfers from junior colleges, took these tests. In ten various departments, first semester junior grade-point averages correlated with lower division grade-point averages of U.C.L.A. students from .51 to .75, with an average of .67; only one department was below .61. With these test scores included, the range was from .60 to .77, with an average of .698.
>
> Transfers from junior colleges to seven departments at U.C.L.A. showed the range of grade-point average correlations between their junior college grade points and those in the University from .53 to .85, with an average of .66. With test scores included, the range was from .59 to .90 with an average of .70. The improvement in correlation was so small that further experimentation with the tests was postponed.

In approximately parallel studies, Spindt[16] and Aigner[17] investigated the relationship of grades in the academic high school subjects to subsequent collegiate achievement as contrasted with that in the nonacademic high school subjects. Spindt's study dealt with the achievement of Berkeley high school students on the Berkeley campus while Aigner's study related to Fairfax high school graduates attending the Los Angeles campus. Spindt found correlation of .55 for the average of academic subjects with a range from an aberrant .02 (biology) to .54 (chemistry, Latin). Nonacademic subjects correlated with University achievement at .20 on the average in both studies with a range from .15 (fine arts) to .27 (practical arts). The results cannot be widely generalized since the groups studied were small (less than 1,000), each of the high schools has a superior record with the University, and the findings are limited to students who actually matriculated to the University.

Because of the limitations mentioned above and others in both the University and the state colleges which were brought to the attention of the Master Plan Survey Team, the Team recommended that "... a continuing Committee on Selection, Admission, and Retention as a part of the co-ordinating agency be established, to make further studies in these fields and to report annually to the appropriate agencies and persons...."

---

[16] Herman A. Spindt, "In Defense of a Subject Pattern," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXVIII (January, 1953), 1.

[17] Herbert L. Aigner, The Relation between Pupils' Records in High School and Success in the Freshman Year of College, M. A. Thesis, U.C.L.A., 1941.

Section III

ADMISSION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This section deals with admission policies and procedures in the junior colleges, state colleges, University of California, and the independent institutions in the state.

Junior Colleges

Trends in Admission Policies and Procedures

The findings of the 1959 survey of selection and retention of students in California junior colleges show a definite raising of the standards during the past five years. (See the Appendix for more details of this survey.) A comparison of facts for 1957-58 with those for 1958-59 shows that California junior colleges have become "tougher" in this respect in the last year. In 1958-59, a larger proportion of students were placed on probation and dismissed, more dropped out, and fewer graduated than during the previous year.

Although California junior colleges must require high standards of achievement from students, it must be remembered that their primary function in California's tripartite system of public higher education is to open rather than close doors to education. The need for this open-door policy in the junior colleges is well supported by a Joint Staff study of the eligibility of California's public high school graduates for admission to publicly supported institutions in the state. On the basis of an analysis of the scholastic record of 73,679 public high school graduates in 43 counties, it was found that 12.8 per cent met the admission requirements of the University of California, an additional 30.1 per cent met state college admission requirements, which left 57.1 per cent who could meet neither. Therefore, the only opportunity for this vast number of high school graduates to continue in public higher education is offered by the junior colleges.[1]

Admission Standards for Beginning Freshman Students

Certain provisions of the Education Code of California define the basis for admission of students. These provisions include Sections 5705, 5706, and 5707 of the 1959 Education Code as follows:

> Section 5705. Each junior college shall provide for the education of pupils in the thirteenth and fourteenth grades and for the education of such adults and minors as may properly be admitted but who are not classified by grade.

---

[1] T. C. Holy and Arthur D. Browne, "A Study of the Eligibility of Graduates of California Public High Schools for Enrollment in California Public Institutions of Higher Learning," California Schools, XXX (December, 1959), Table 1. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

> Section 5706. The principal of any two-year junior college shall admit to the junior college any high school graduate and any other person over 18 years of age who in his judgment is capable of profiting from the instruction offered. The principal of any two-year junior college may admit to the junior college any apprentice, as defined in Section 3077 of the Labor Code, who in the principal's judgment is capable of profiting from the instruction offered.
>
> Section 5707. The principal of any junior college may, notwithstanding any provision of this code to the contrary and in accordance with such rules as the governing board of the district maintaining the junior college may adopt, admit to the junior college any person who has served in the active military service of the United States or of the State of California for at least 90 days during a war with any foreign power or during any period of national emergency declared by the President of the United States.

In addition to the foregoing, Section 5706.5 provides that "the principal of any two-year junior college may admit to the junior college as a special part-time student any twelfth grade high school student whose admission is recommended by his high school principal."

The law governing admission actually defines the role of the junior or community college in California. It provides an opportunity for all to procure education beyond high school. Although everyone is accorded the opportunity, only those who apply themselves and achieve should be permitted to continue.

In the summary in Appendix I, which describes the August, 1959, survey of junior college practices in selection and retention, the following data are shown:

1) That 50 colleges out of 56 reporting admit all high school graduates. In accordance with the law, just quoted, junior colleges are required to admit all high school graduates who meet legal residence requirements. On no other basis should admission be denied a high school graduate.

2) That 36 junior colleges of the 56 responding admit all persons over eighteen years of age. The 20 colleges that do not are within their legal rights to deny admission to any applicant deemed not capable of profiting from the instruction offered.

3) That 30 colleges out of 56 admit some beginning freshmen on probation. This practice is based on the supposition that such students are poor scholastic risks and hence should be eliminated without delay, unless the supposition proves false. Such practice may be questioned in terms of the role of the junior college in California's system of higher education. It is doubtful that placing a

beginning student on probation with the intent to dismiss him at the end of one semester provides ample opportunity for the student to make a satisfactory adjustment to college life.

Admission of Students from Other Colleges

Of the 56 junior colleges reporting, 45 stated they do not admit all students wishing to transfer from other colleges. The most prevalent reason given for denial of admission is "unsatisfactory scholastic performance in previous college." The Committee agrees that failure of a student in another junior college warrants denial of admission. However, scholastic failure in a state college, the University, or in a private college should not necessarily preclude admission to a junior college. Part of the role of the junior college is that of "salvaging" worthy students. It should be a place where students who have failed to perform satisfactorily in another college may have one more chance to demonstrate ability to do college work successfully.

Of the 56 junior colleges reporting, 54 admit students transferring from other colleges on probation. This is justifiable if previous scholastic performance was below standard.

Admission Standards for Certain Courses or Curricula

Altogether 50 junior colleges have admission standards for certain courses or curricula; four colleges report no such admission requirements; two colleges, although not having admission standards, do select the best applicants. The following tabulation shows present selection practices. The figures specify the number of junior colleges.

Courses or Curricula for Which Admission Standards Exist:	
Mathematics	26
English	32
Natural science	19
Vocational curricula	34
Engineering	5
Social science	14
Registered nursing	9
Foreign language	3

Type of Admission Standards:	
Placement examination	40
Prerequisite courses	19
Ability or aptitude test	15
Achievement test	24
Qualifying examination	6
High school grade standard	6
Personal interview approval	7
Physical examination	5

Placement of students in courses and curricula where they can succeed is an important challenge to each junior college. As already noted, one of the primary functions of the junior college is to assist students through guidance and counseling to "find themselves" and to procure education in accordance with their varying capacities. In the light of this function, the Committee believes that strong counseling programs rather than rigid or specific admission requirements to course or curricula will best enable the junior college to fulfill its role.

State Colleges

Historical Development of Undergraduate Admission Requirements in the State Colleges

In accordance with the provisions of Education Code Sections 152 and 23701 (Statutes of 1959), the State Board of Education is empowered to adopt rules and regulations for the government of the state colleges in prescribing (1) the standards of admission for students entering the state colleges and (2) the rules and regulations for transfer of students from one state college to another. Such rules and regulations must be adopted at a joint meeting of the State Board of Education and representatives of the state colleges. The rules and regulations are published in Group 3, Admission Requirements, of Subchapter 4 of Chapter 1, California Administrative Code, Title 5, Education. Requirements are established for admission to freshman standing, advanced undergraduate standing, graduate standing, and teacher education.

In the early 1930's, the State Board of Education adopted freshman admission requirements which involved high school performance and the formal recommendation of the high school principal. When the institutions became state colleges in 1935, the Board undertook the restudy of freshman admission requirements. In 1937, the Board eliminated state-wide requirements for admission to the state colleges, leaving to each college the autonomous administration of its own admissions program. At the time of the 1947 legislative study entitled A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education (1948), generally known as the "Strayer Committee Report," the regulations of the State Board of Education stated, "High school graduates and other applicants possessing equivalent preparation may be admitted to a state college upon evidence of fitness to profit from college instruction, such fitness to be shown by previous scholastic records, by evidence of good moral character and personal qualifications, and by a satisfactory score on a standard college aptitude test...." The authors of the report concluded that freshman admission requirements should be reviewed and revised. Furthermore, they questioned whether the standards then in effect, as implemented in the various colleges, were sufficiently selective and suggested that the colleges adopt requirements designed to admit students who could better profit from the programs of the colleges.[2]

In 1951, the State Board of Education adopted admission requirements which included the following standards:

1. Freshman applicants should be admitted if they have completed five Carnegie units (ten semester units or grades) of "A" or "B" work in the last three years of high school, or if they have attained a score at the twentieth percentile or better on a college entrance test.
2. Transfer applicants should be admitted if they have earned a grade-point average of "C" or better on their college work, or they may receive special consideration if they have scored at

---

[2] Monroe E. Deutsch, Aubrey A. Douglass and George D. Strayer, A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948, pp. 34, 35.

the twentieth percentile or better on a college entrance test. Junior college transfer applicants who had been ineligible for admission as freshmen were required to complete 24 units of work with a grade-point average of "C" or better before they could be considered for admission.

3. Graduate applicants should be admitted if they have earned an acceptable baccalaureate degree and have demonstrated other qualifications as established by each college.

In addition, the State Board of Education gave to each college the authority to admit students on probation who did not meet these standards.

In 1954, a new review of admission requirements was undertaken by a committee of state college administrative personnel. The committee worked for nearly a year, performing the following activities:

1. Reviewing college and university admission practices in institutions in other states.

2. Making studies of state college students, including the correlation of high school grades and entrance test scores with success in particular state colleges.

3. Reviewing and evaluating successive proposals for changes in requirements for admission.

The work of the committee was co-ordinated with the 1953 study authorized by the Legislature and entitled A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education (1955). In 1955, the work of the committee culminated in action by the State Board of Education in adopting the following new standards for the admission of freshmen to the state colleges:

1. Freshman applicants should be admitted if they have completed seven Carnegie units (14 semester units or grades) of "A" or "B" work in the last three years of high school in subjects other than physical education or military science; or

2. Freshman applicants should be admitted if they have completed five or more Carnegie units (ten semester units or grades) of "A" or "B" work in the last three years of high school, as above, and have attained a score at or above the twentieth percentile on the national norms of a standard college aptitude test; or

3. Freshman applicants who fail to meet these standards may be admitted if, in the judgment of appropriate college authorities, they give promise of being able to succeed in college.

Admission standards for transfer and graduate students were not changed at the time of the 1955 revision of freshman requirements.

Recent studies of the performance of undergraduate transfer students in the state colleges, made under the direction of a joint committee of state college and junior college administrators, led to the adoption in September, 1959, of new rules and regulations governing the admission of applicants with advanced undergraduate standing, which will be in effect for the fall semester of 1961. Changes will affect primarily those applicants who are ineligible for freshman admission to the state colleges on the basis of their high school records, by requiring such applicants to complete 60 units of college work with a grade-point average of "C" or better before transfer.

Summary

Changes adopted by the State Board of Education, affecting admission requirements for freshmen and advanced students, have tended to be major ones, made at fairly widespread intervals and after intensive study. Within the framework provided by the rules and regulations adopted by the Board for inclusion in the California Administrative Code, Title 5, Education (published by the Division of Administrative Procedure, Sacramento) the colleges have taken local actions which have resulted in progressively tighter standards. The following are examples of such local actions:

1. The establishment of local policies and procedures for the objective screening of applicants who do not meet regular admission standards, which are geared to the availability of junior college facilities and the nature of state college curricula.
2. Improvements of the admissions testing program and extension of the program to all new undergraduate students; use of test results for admissions counseling, academic advising, course placement, screening in teacher education, and the like.
3. Systematic reduction in the number of students accepted in fulfillment of junior college functions by restricting such admissions in accordance with policies based on geography, academic potential, motivation, and other relevant factors.
4. Extension of the requirement of full matriculation to all registered students, regardless of course load carried.

Admission to Freshman Standing

Freshmen applicants without previous college experience may be admitted to the state colleges under any one of the following provisions of the Administrative Code, Title 5, Education:

Section 925: High School Graduates. For admission to a state college, a high school graduate, or other applicant who is judged by the appropriate college authorities to possess equivalent preparation, must as a minimum, meet one of the following:

(a) Have completed the equivalent of 70 semester periods (7 Carnegie units) of course work, in subjects other than physical education and military science, with grades of A or B on a five-point scale during the last three years in high school.

(b) Have completed the equivalent of 50 semester periods (5 Carnegie units) of course work, in subjects other than physical education and military science, with grades of A or B on a five-point scale during the last three years in high school and attained the twentieth percentile on the national norm of a standard college aptitude test.

An applicant who fails to meet these standards may be admitted, if in the judgment of the appropriate college authorities, he gives promise of being able to succeed in college.

This section further provides that admissions to a state college "shall be limited to the number of students for whom facilities and competent instructors are available to provide opportunity for an adequate college education."

Section 926: Adult Special Students. An applicant who has attained the age of 21 years and is not a high school graduate may be admitted to the state college as an adult special student provided that he demonstrates to the proper college authorities, ability to profit from college work. If such a student completes with a grade-point average of 1.0 (grade C on a five-point scale) or better a program of 24 semester or 36 quarter units of residence work in basic courses leading to a degree, he shall not be required to remove entrance deficiencies.

Section 927: Colleges authorized to maintain curriculums of less than four years in length may admit to such curriculums, students who meet California junior college entrance requirements.

This section may be invoked for applications at Chico and Humboldt State Colleges, which perform junior college functions, and at Fresno State College and California State Polytechnic College, which offer two-year technical curriculums in agriculture.

Analysis of Freshman Enrollments.

Of the nearly 13,000 students classified as freshmen in the state colleges in the fall of 1958, only 65 per cent had been admitted that fall as new, first-time freshmen, in accordance with the Administrative Code provisions previously cited. The remainder of the group was admitted under the provisions for transfer students, or registered as continuing or returning freshmen who had not yet attained sophomore status. An analysis of the 1958 freshman enrollment is given in Table 4. "Transfer" freshmen constituted 11 per cent of the freshmen enrollment in the fall of 1958, while continuing (or returning) freshmen accounted for 24 per cent of the group. Of the new, first-time freshmen, 88 per cent were prior-year high school graduates, while 12 per cent had graduated from high school before 1958. Thus, the state colleges in the fall of 1958 admitted less than 6 per cent of the more than 124,000 graduates from the California public and private high schools in 1957-58.

TABLE 4

Analysis of Freshman Enrollments in the California State Colleges, Fall of 1958

Category	Number	Per cent
Prior-year high school graduate	7,372	57
Old high school graduate	1,034	8
Freshman transfer	1,425	11
Continuing or returning freshmen	3,123	24
Total	12,954	100

Numbers of state college freshmen admitted under the various provisions of the California Administrative Code cited above are given in Table 5, for the 1957 and 1958 classes. Altogether 78 per cent of the new freshmen in 1957, and 80 per cent in 1958, were admitted in accordance with Code Section 925 (a), with at least seven recommending units. An additional 13 per cent in 1957, and 12 per cent in 1958, were admitted with at least five but less than seven recommending units, and an aptitude test score at or above the twentieth percentile on national four-year college norms.

Adult special students, who are not high school graduates, constituted only 2 per cent of the 1957 new freshman group and less than 1 per cent in 1958. Students admitted to two-year programs constituted 2 per cent of the freshman admissions in 1957, and 3 per cent in 1958. Greater restriction on admissions to junior college programs at two state colleges were offset by increasing numbers of students admitted to two-year agricultural programs at Fresno State and California State Polytechnic Colleges.

Successful applicants in the "other" category of Section 925 of the California Administrative Code, and as shown in Table 5, included foreign students and high school graduates whose transcripts are not readily evaluated in terms of recommending units, as well as California applicants who do not qualify according to the standards in Section 925 (a) or (b). The latter group includes large numbers of students who have enrolled in a strictly academic program in high school, shown progress by earning recommending units in the junior and/or senior year, and attained high scores on aptitude and achievement tests of the basic skills. A sliding scale of recommending units and test scores has been frequently applied in relation to the applicant's choice of major. Test scores have been given particular attention in the cases of adult applicants who are high school graduates with relatively poor high school grades but relevant intervening experience.

TABLE 5

Basis for Admission of First-Time Freshmen to the California State Colleges, Fall of 1957 and 1958

Basis for Admission	Admin. code section	Fall, 1957		Fall, 1958	
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Seven recommending units	925(a)	6,134	78	6,833	80
Five or six recommending units, test score 20th percentile	925(b)	1,002	13	1,019	12
"Other"[a]	925	340	4	310	4
Adult special	926	178	2	78	1
Nondegree programs[b]	927	187	2	294	3
Total		7,841	99	8,534	100

---

[a] Includes foreign students, out-of-state students not admitted on the basis of recommending units, adult high school graduates, and others not meeting standards in Section 925(a) or (b), California Administrative Code.

[b] Includes junior college admissions at Chico and Humboldt, and technical agriculture programs at California State Polytechnic College and Fresno State College.

Enrollment trends for six state colleges which had well-established freshman classes in 1952 are given in Table 6 for new, first-time freshmen. Per cent increases are given for the "new, first-time freshman" figures reported in the table, for the "total freshman" class in each of the colleges (transfers and continuing students, as well as new freshmen), and the total enrollment at each college. For the individual colleges, the per cent of change for the seven-year period ranges from a loss of 10 per cent, at one of the large institutions, to a gain of 134 per cent at the smallest institution.

TABLE 6

New, First-Time Freshman Enrollment Trends in Selected State Colleges By Years, 1952 Through 1958 [a]

Year	State Colleges						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
1952	199	508	828	955	943	1,425	4,858
1953	226	541	732	842	921	1,853	5,115
1954	369	642	804	821	993	1,488	5,117
1955	394	517	693	775	1,157	1,604	5,140
1956	315	711	831	776	1,328	1,655	5,616
1957	404	627	800	775	1,228	1,836	5,670
1958	465	624	788	857	1,399	1,890	6,023

Per Cent of Increase, 1958 Over 1952

New, first-time freshmen	134	23	-5	-10	48	33	24
Total freshmen increase	158	105	14	29	42	31	44
Over-all college increase	191	108	75	87	102	91	95

[a] Colleges with freshmen classes dating back as far as 1952.

Source: State College Reports

For the six colleges combined, the increase in new, first-time freshmen in 1958, over 1952, is only 24 per cent. However, the total freshman enrollment gained 44 per cent during this same period. An explanation for this difference lies in the fact that a 48 per cent increase in the freshman transfer group and a 145 per cent increase in the continuing or returning freshman group occurred during the period of 1952 to 1958. It thus appears that the relatively large increase in freshman enrollments in the long-established state colleges is more the result of a "piling up" of freshmen who earn less than 30 units during the first year, than of increases in new, first-time freshmen. Furthermore, the increase in freshman enrollments is small in comparison with the total six-college enrollment increase of 95 per cent, from 1952 to 1958, with a range of individual college increases from 75 per cent (where a loss in first-time freshmen was recorded) to 191 per cent (at the smallest college).

Quality of Entering Freshmen

An adequate assessment of the effectiveness of state college admission standards should take into account the quality of the group produced by the standards in relation to comparable college groups, the nature of the curriculum for which admission standards are adopted, the severity of the grading standards, the policies for scholastic probation and disqualification (dropped for poor scholastic record), and the quality of the product graduated. While data reported here are limited to the quality of entering freshmen in relation to performance [illegible] interpretation of the findings should include consideration of the nature of the curriculum, grading standards, and retention policies.

Numbers of recommending units presented by more than 6,000 freshmen entering nine state colleges in the fall of 1958 are presented in Table 7. Although the standard [illegible] for the fall of 1958 [illegible] is only seven recommending units [illegible] offered at least 12 recommending units. There were 11 per cent of the group who earned only five or six recommending units and were thus required to qualify on the basis of a satisfactory aptitude test score. The high school record of the freshmen women is considerably better than that of the men in the 1958 group: 41 per cent of the women earned 12 or more recommending units in high school, and 85 per cent earned more than the minimally required seven. Less than one-fourth of the men earned as many as 12 recommending units, while 18 per cent qualified with five or six units and a satisfactory test score. Thus, on the basis of the high school record of recommending units, the freshmen women appear to be somewhat superior to the men admitted in accordance with existing admission standards.

Academic aptitude test percentile scores are given for these same state college freshmen in Table 8. The results show that state college freshmen are, in general, similar to freshmen in other four-year colleges and universities. The state college group, however, tends to be somewhat more homogeneous than the national group since the requirement of seven recommending units in high school tends to screen out applicants with ability scores below the twentieth percentile. State college freshmen men earned higher scores than the women on the academic aptitude test when medians, quartiles, and percentiles distributions are compared. Findings from the administration of achievement tests in reading, writing, mathematics, social science, and natural science also tend to favor freshmen men in the state colleges over the women, the only exceptions being some subtests in English.

TABLE 7

High School Recommending Units for Freshmen Admitted to Nine State Colleges, Fall of 1958

Recommending units	Men		Women		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
12 or more	571	22	1,451	41	2,022	33
9-11	812	31	1,250	35	2,062	33
8	371	14	312	9	683	11
7	379	15	328	9	707	11
6	248	9	128	4	376	6
5	237	9	82	2	319	5
Total	2,618	100	3,551	100	6,169	99

TABLE 8

Aptitude Test Percentile Ranges for Freshmen Admitted to Nine State Colleges, Fall of 1958[a]

Percentile range	Men		Women		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
80-99	624	24	591	17	1,215	20
60-79	716	27	822	23	1,538	25
40-59	664	25	912	26	1,576	25
20-39	428	16	785	22	1,213	20
0-19	186	7	441	12	627	10
Total	2,618	-	3,551	-	6,169	-

[a] Tests used include the American Council on Education Psychological Examination (ACE), the School and College Ability Test (SCAT), and the College Qualifying Test (CQT). Percentile scores are based on national norms for four-year colleges.

Bivariate distributions of recommending units and aptitude test scores are given in Table 9, for men and women separately. The largest concentration of freshmen of both sexes is found in the upper right cells of the table, with high test scores and recommending units equal to at least nine. A comparison of the sexes shows that the men earned fewer grades of "A" and "B" in high school and were more variable in high school performance than the women. Too additional sex differences may be noted from the table. First, the tendency to overachieve in high school is more pronounced in the freshmen women, as evidenced by high numbers of recommending units and low aptitude test scores. Second, many freshmen men failed to earn the recommending units in high school which their high aptitude test scores would seem to predict. In any case, an increase in admission standards based solely on an increase in high school recommending units would discriminate against potential male freshmen, probably unfairly in light of their native and demonstrated ability on admission tests.

TABLE 9

Per Cent Relation of Aptitude Test Percentile Scores and High School Recommending Units of Freshmen Admitted to Nine State Colleges
Fall of 1958[a]

Aptitude test percentile range		Recommending units						
		5	6	7	8	9-11	12+	Totals
80-99	Men	2	2	2	2	8	8	24
	Women	+	+	+	+	4	11	17
	Total	1	1	1	1	6	10	20
60-79	Men	2	2	3	4	9	7	27
	Women		1	1	2	7	12	23
	Total	1	1	2	3	8	9	25
40-59	Men	3	3	4	3	8	4	25
	Women	1	1	2	2	10	10	26
	Total	1	2	3	2	9	7	25
20-39	Men	2	2	3	3	4	2	16
	Women	1	1	3	3	8	6	22
	Total	2	2	3	3	6	4	20
0-19	Men	-	-	2	2	2	1	7
	Women	-	-	2	2	5	3	12
	Total	-	-	2	2	4	1	10
Totals	Men	9	9	15	14	31	22	-
	Women	2	4	9	9	35	41	-
	Total	5	6	11	11	33	33	-

---

[a] Per cents less than 1 are indicated by "-". Rows and column sums do not in all cases equal the "total" entries, because of rounding errors.

Performance of Entering Freshmen

The performance of state college freshmen entering in the fall of 1958 is tabulated in Table 10 in terms of high school recommending units and aptitude test scores earned by students with cumulative first-year grade-point averages below "C" (2.00), including students disqualified after one or two semesters. First-year rather than first-semester grade-point averages were chosen for the analysis when it was found that freshmen completing two semesters performed significantly better in the second semester than in the first.

Data for more than 5,000 state college freshmen from seven state colleges are used in this table of performance. Results show that one-third of the freshmen were in some academic difficulty at the end of the first year in terms of having a shortage of one-half grade point or more. The one-third includes 38 per cent of the male freshmen and 28 per cent of the female freshmen.

Although one-third of the freshmen failed to earn a cumulative grade-point average of "C" or better for the first year, only 14 per cent of the group were disqualified for scholarship reasons. The 14 per cent includes 18 per cent of the men and 11.5 per cent of the women. Of the more than 5,000 freshmen studied then, 86 per cent had earned grades in their freshman year which were sufficiently high to enable them to continue their education in the state colleges. Several of the colleges have adopted policies of liberal disqualification at the end of the first semester, whereas others disqualify almost exclusively after a two-semester trial. At all of the colleges a disqualified student may apply for re-admission if he can show that he used the intervening period to overcome the problems responsible for his disqualification. Thus, state college disqualification is less final, or less a stamp of failure, than at colleges which disqualify (and readmit) less freely.

When the records of men and women in the group included in Table 10 are studied separately, in all respects the record of the freshman women is superior to that of the men in the state college freshman year. A smaller per cent of women were disqualified, a smaller per cent earned grades below "C", and a larger per cent earned grades of "B" or better. However, the difference appears somewhat less pronounced in the cumulative first-year grades than in the first-semester grades. It is possible that the male students "catch up" in terms of earning high grades as they progress through college.

TABLE 10

Recommending Units and Aptitude Test Scores Earned by Fall 1958 State College Freshmen with Cumulative First-Year Grade-Point Averages Below "C"[a] (Men and Women)

Recommending units	Aptitude test score percentiles																	
	0–19			20–39			40–59			60–79			80–99			Total		
		Below "C"			Below "C"			Below "C"			Below "C"			Below "C"			Below "C"	
	Total no. of students	No. of students	Per cent of total	Total no. of students	No. of students	Per cent of total	Total no. of students	No. of students	Per cent of total	Total no. of students	No. of students	Per cent of total	Total no. of students	No. of students	Per cent of total	Overall total no. of students	No. of students	Per cent of total
12 or more	76	28	37	190	52	27	345	65	19	480	56	12	475	28	6	1,566	229	15
9–11	193	94	49	326	121	37	471	155	33	433	116	27	321	77	24	1,744	563	32
8	90	50	56	135	66	49	138	65	47	152	59	39	72	20	28	587	260	44
7	99	59	60	151	75	50	162	80	49	126	49	39	60	19	32	598	282	47
6				86	47	55	116	69	59	75	37	49	45	22	49	322	175	54
5				83	47	57	87	51	59	71	38	54	30	14	47	271	150	55
Total	458	231	50	971	408	42	1,319	485	37	1,337	355	26	1,003	180	18	5,088	1,659	33

[a] Seven state colleges are included in the sample: Chico, Humboldt, Long Beach, San Diego, San Fernando Valley, San Francisco, and San Jose. Students disqualified after either one or two semesters are included.

Probability of Disqualification

In tables 11, 12, and 13 probability of disqualification for scholarship during or at the end of the freshman year is related to high school recommending units and aptitude test performance. Data for men and women are presented separately, on the basis of preliminary tabulations that showed different levels of relationship for the sexes. Probability of disqualification based on recommending units is given in Table 11; probability of disqualification based on aptitude test scores, in Table 12. In Table 13, with the assumption of a common rate of disqualification, regardless of quality, the expected number of disqualifications among students with particular test scores and recommending units is compared with the actual number of disqualifications among students with the same qualities. Table 13 is thus a table of joint probabilities; it uses both recommending units and aptitude test scores.

Data in Table 13 indicate that freshmen with test scores below the twentieth percentile tend to be poor academic risks unless they have earned at least 12 recommending units in high school; that freshmen with five or six recommending units tend to be poor risks, regardless of their aptitude test scores; and that freshmen with seven or eight recommending units tend to be poor academic risks unless they achieve aptitude test scores at the sixtieth percentile or better. A sliding scale of high school recommending units and aptitude test score percentiles could be developed from data similar to those in Table 13, for use in eliminating potential failures in the freshman class.

The original data for this table showed men and women separately. From these data, which are not included in the table, it is apparent that the best academic "risks" are men and women who have earned at least 12 recommending units in high school, or women with aptitude test scores at the eightieth percentile or higher. Probability of disqualification is highest among freshmen entering with fewer than nine recommending units, among men below sixtieth percentile, and among women below the fortieth percentile on the academic aptitude test. Probability of disqualification rises most consistently in relation to the aptitude test score for freshman women when the high school record is ignored.

Prediction of students earning grade point averages of "B" or better, from recommending units and test scores, is considerably more reliable than the prediction of disqualifications. Approximately 80 per cent of the grade averages equal to "B" or better were earned by students (male and female) in the top 40 per cent of the test score distribution. Women with 12 or more recommending units (42 per cent of the sample) earned 85 per cent of the grade-point averages of "B" or better, whereas men with at least 12 recommending units (23 per cent of the sample) earned 63 per cent of the high grades.

Relationships and probabilities do not in themselves dictate action in revising (or reaffirming) admission standards. The problem is one of judging whether a student who has one chance in four of incurring a first disqualification by the end of the freshman year is a proper risk for the state colleges.

TABLE 11

Probability of Disqualification, Based on Recommending Units of Freshmen Admitted to the State Colleges, Fall of 1958

Recommending units	Men			Women		
	Per cent earning units	Per cent of disqualifications	Chance of disqualification	Per cent earning units	Per cent of disqualifications	Chance of disqualification
12 or more	23	7	1: 20.5	42	14	1: 26
9 - 10 - 11	30	29	1: 6.5	34	37	1: 8
8	14	17	1: 5	9	16	1: 5
7	14	18	1: 5	9	21	1: 3.5
6	10	13	1: 4.5	4	7	1: 4.5
5	9	15	1: 3.5	2	5	1: 4
Total	100	99	1: 6	100	100	1: 8.5

TABLE 12

Probability of Disqualification, Based on Aptitude Test Scores of Freshmen Admitted to the State Colleges, Fall of 1958

Aptitude percentile range	Men			Women		
	Per cent earning scores	Per cent of disqualifications	Chance of disqualification	Per cent earning scores	Per cent of disqualifications	Chance of disqualification
80-99	21	15	1: 8	17	3	1: 49
60-79	25	21	1: 7.5	20	9	1: 18.5
40-59	25	28	1: 5.5	24	19	1: 11
20-39	19	22	1: 5.5	23	38	1: 5
0-19	10	14	1: 4.5	15	30	1: 4
Total	100	100	1: 6.5	99	99	1: 8.5

TABLE 13

Probability of Disqualification, Based on Recommending Units and Test Scores of Entering Freshmen Admitted to the State Colleges, Fall of 1958[a]

Number of recommending units	Disqualifications	Aptitude test percentile ranges					
		0-19	20-39	40-59	60-79	80-99	Total
12 or more	Expected[b]	13.3	27.4	40.7	47.5	53.7	182.8
	Obtained[c]	13	13	9	14	7	56
9-10-11	Expected[b]	27.4	37.4	43.6	35.6	29.0	173.0
	Obtained[c]	43	42	41	32	19	177
7-8	Expected[b]	21.3	27.4	23.9	18.6	9.5	100.6
	Obtained[c]	56	63	48	16	9	192
5-6	Expected[b]	2.4	15.6	15.7	11.1	5.0	49.8
	Obtained[c]	7	42	26	17	12	104
Total	Expected[b]	68.0	114.3	130.0	117.4	99.4	529.0
	Obtained[c]	119	160	124	79	47	529

---

[a] Table based on 529 freshmen (253 men and 276 women) admitted to the state colleges who were disqualified during the freshman year.

[b] The figures to the right and under the aptitude test ranges represent the statistical number of the 529 freshmen included in the table who would be expected to be disqualified.

[c] The figures to the right and under those described in (b) represent the actual number of the 529 who were disqualified in each category. The sum of these individual members equal the 529.

University of California

Historical Development of Undergraduate Admission Requirements in the University of California[3]

Since the establishment of the University in the fall of 1869, a variety of admission procedures have been followed. Fundamental, of course, in contrast with some state universities, was the grant of power to The Regents, who were given in the act establishing the University the right to set the "moral and intellectual qualifications for admission." As a matter of practice, the right was transferred to the faculty, tacitly at first, formally in 1885. The practices followed by the faculty may most quickly be summarized in outline form:

Years

1869-81: Oral examinations

1881-84: Written examinations, with algebra and geometry required for agriculture and mechanic arts, and classical languages added for letters.

1884-1917: On the basis of official "accrediting," the recommendation of the high school principal was accepted in lieu of examination. Examinations were required of the applicant in subjects not recommended. Admission by examination was continued.

1917-18: All students recommended by the military forces for enrollment in the Student Army Training Corps were admitted.

1919-31: Admission granted on the recommendations of the applicant by the high school principal, as distinguished from the recommendation that the courses taken by the applicant exempt him from all or part of his entrance examinations.

1931-33: The present subject pattern was established and admission granted on the achievement of eight units of "A" or "B" grade in the ten required units.

The following subject distribution made up the required pattern:

U. S. History and Civics.	1 unit
English	3 units
Algebra and Geometry.	2 units
Laboratory Science	1 unit
Foreign Language	2 units
Advanced Course (consisting of Mathematics, Foreign Language or Science)	1(or 2)units

---

[3] These materials taken from a mimeographed report prepared by the Office of Relations with Schools, dated August, 1959 and entitled, "Information About Functions and Responsibilities of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, University of California."

1933 to present:

> A "B" average in those subjects of the required pattern taken in the last three years of high school. In addition to this fundamental plan by which about 88 per cent of entering freshmen are admitted, a number of variant methods are in use to take care of the applicant of good quality who for one reason or another does not meet the specific requirements in subject matter. Out-of-state applicants who are not children of alumni must stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible. (The number of freshmen admitted by these various plans are shown in Table 14 which follows.)

TABLE 14

Number of Freshmen Admitted and Registered Under Regular and Alternate Plans of Admission, by Campus of the University of California, 1952-56[a], and the Over-All Per Cent Distribution by Plan for 1957-58

Plan of admission	Berkeley	L. A.	Davis	Riverside[b]	Total	Per cent of total	
						1952-56	1957-58
"B" average	6,750	5,272	555	438	13,015	83.4[c]	88.1[c]
Highest 10 per cent of class	66	118	45	23	252	1.6	1.1
12 "A" or "B" grades in last three years	189	140	38	20	387	2.5	1.8
Six "A" or "B" grades in last two years	98	24	25	5	152	1.0	.9
Exceptions to the rules	469	411	87	92	1,059	6.8	3.4
Out-of-state schools bonafide residents	243	209	20	10	482	3.1	3.2
Out-of-state schools non-residents[d]	128	52	4	3	187	1.2	1.5
Total	7,943	6,226	774	591	15,534	99.6	100.0

[a] Santa Barbara is not included in this summary because its most-used plan of admission is different from the "B" average plan. Santa Barbara will use the same requirements as other campuses after September, 1958.

[b] Riverside figures are for the three-year period 1953-56.

[c] If the out-of-state schools groups (all of whom have met the "B" average plan) are included, these per cents become 87.7 and 92.8 respectively.

[d] Bonafide residents are: 1) California residents who left the State to attend high schools in other states; 2) graduates of out-of-state high schools who are actual residents of California at the time of registration; 3) children of alumni of the University of California.

In 1946, nonresidents (defined as graduates of out-of-state high schools not coming under the definition of bonafide residents) were required to meet higher scholastic standards than were graduates of California high schools.

Admission to Freshman Standing

Since 1933, the requirements for admission to freshman standing have remained virtually unchanged and have been based on high scholastic achievement in a required list of academic-type subjects. About 88 per cent (1952-56) to 93 per cent (1957-58) of all freshmen admitted qualify under Plan 1, a "B" average in the required pattern of subjects taken in the last three years of the high school. About 5 per cent qualify by the so-called alternate methods of admission, and from 2½ per cent to 7 per cent qualify as exceptions to the rules. The per cent qualifying as exceptions to the rules shows a marked decrease in the years 1957-58 (3.4 per cent) as compared with 1952-56 (6.8 per cent).

A study of the achievement of applicants admitted under the various plans indicates that Plan 1 (a "B" average) is consistently better than other alternate plans. Table 15, covering the years 1952 through 1957, relates the method of freshman admission on individual campuses to the per cent of such freshman with GPA[4] of below "C" at the end of the first semester in the University. It will be noted that on all the campuses the lowest per cent with grades below a "C" average with the exception of nonresidents from out-of-state schools admitted under special rules (these as will be noted from Table 14 constitute less than 2 per cent of the total), is in the group admitted under the "B" average plan. Because of this effort has been made to remedy the weaknesses of the alternate plans. These plans with their year of adoption are as follows:

In Highest Tenth of High School Graduation Class

1946 - Students thus admitted in addition to a scholarship rank in the highest tenth of their graduating class, must have a substantial academic preparation.

1958 - Substantial academic preparation was defined as "not less than ten units in courses designated by the high school principal as college preparatory in nature and chosen from the fields of English, mathematics, science, foreign language, and social science."

Twelve "A" or "B" Grades in Last Three Years of High School

1952 - In addition to completing not less than 12 high school units of grade "A" or "B" in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth years, these students cannot have more than two subject deficiencies in the (a) to (f) pattern of required subjects.

1956 - An added qualification: "...and in addition must receive in the (a) to (f) subjects attempted no grades lower than 'C' and an average of at least 'B'."

Six "A" or "B" Grades in Last Two Years of High School

1952 - Students admitted under this plan must complete not less than 12 high school units with no grade lower than "C" in work taken in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth years exclusive of grades earned in religion, physical education, military science, and ROTC, and have not less than six high school units of grade "A" or "B" selected from the following ten units of academic subjects:

---

[4] Grade-point average

Third and fourth year English
Third and fourth year mathematics
Third and fourth year laboratory science
Third and fourth year foreign language
Third and fourth year history or social science, of
which one must be United States history

1958 - In addition to the above, "In the (a) to (f) subjects completed in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth years, achieve a scholarship standing: (1) with no grade lower than 'C'; and (2) with no more than ½ unit of scholarship deficiency, i.e., not more than ½ unit below the 'B' average."

Admission by Examination

1951 - This plan was changed to require an average of a standard score of 500 on the two parts of the aptitude test and three assigned achievement tests of the College Entrance Examination Board.

1959 - The plan was further changed in 1959 to an average of a standard score of 500 on the two parts of the aptitude tests, and no score below 500 on three assigned achievement tests; the (a) to (f) subjects must be covered by "C" or better grades in high school or by achievement test scores of 500 or higher. (Estimates based on the record of applicants admitted by examination in the fall of 1957 indicate that the number of students who will be admitted by examination under this change will be reduced 60 per cent.)

Admission by examination applies only to those California residents whose scholastic average on required subjects in the high schools is below a "B" average. The results of a study of admission by examination during the period 1951-1959 raises serious question as to the continuance of admission by examination in any period when the size of the lower division is reduced as a matter of policy. The median grade-point average achieved by 15 students admitted to the Los Angeles campus of the University in the fall of 1957 was 2.27; on the Berkeley campus, 42 students achieved a median grade-point average of 1.89. The correlation between examination standings and first semester achievement at Berkeley was only .17.

The committee is of the opinion that detailed study of each phase of an admissions plan followed by remedial regulation to meet demonstrated weakness is the proper approach to be followed in the improvement not only of the University of California admissions policies but those of other institutions as well.

TABLE 15

Median Grade-point Averages on Subjects of Required Pattern Completed in High School, and Median Grade-point Averages in First Semester's Work and Per Cent Below "C" in the First Semester in the University of California 1952 Through 1957[a]

Plan of admission (A=3.0)	Berkeley			Los Angeles			Davis			Riverside[b]		
	HS	UC		HS	UC		HS	UC		HS	UC	
	Med. of GPA	Med. of GPA	Per cent below "C"	Med. of GPA	Med. of GPA	Per cent below "C"	Med. of GPA	Med. of GPA	Per cent below "C"	Med. of GPA	Med. of GPA	Per cent below "C"
"B" average	2.43	1.43	22.9	2.47	1.44	24.4	2.41	2.46	19.6	2.51	1.27[c]	32.8
Highest 10 per cent of class	2.27	1.29	28.6	2.48	1.46	26.5	2.38	1.53	22.1	–	–	–
Twelve "A" or "B" grades in last three years	2.45	1.30	28.9	2.42	1.23	31.2	2.37	1.29	22.6	–	–	–
Six "A" or "B" grades in last two years	1.94	1.17	36.6	1.93	1.17	34.9	1.96	1.07	35.1	–	–	–
Exceptions to the rules	1.95	1.08	42.6	2.08	1.13	38.9	1.92	1.12	36.6	–	–	–
Out-of-state schools: bonafide residents	2.34	1.39	29.3	2.44	1.45	24.2	2.19	1.53	35.0[d]	–	–	–
Out-of-state schools: non-residents admitted under special rules	2.67	1.50	19.9	2.64	1.57	20.3	2.60	1.45	e	–	–	–

[a] The figures for the period 1952-56 and those for 1956-57 have been averaged.

[b] Riverside figures are for the last four years covered by the table.

[c] Riverside data for three years only.

[d] Includes the years 1952-56 only.

[e] No cases.

Admission with Advanced Standing

Characteristic of California's public colleges and universities is the fact of transfer--transfer from junior colleges to both University and state colleges, among the various campuses of the University, the state colleges, and private institutions and between the University system and the state college system. Table 16 shows the number of undergraduate students who transferred to a state college, the source from which they came, and the level to which the transfer was made. As would be expected, the largest number of such transfers came from the junior colleges. Of the 12,886 transfers shown in the table, 8,705 or 67.6 per cent came from the junior colleges. The second largest number, 2,039, came from out-of-state sources.

TABLE 16

New Registered Undergraduate Student Transfers to the State Colleges by Level and Type of Institution of Origin, 1956-57

From:	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Total	Per cent
California state colleges	111	154	248	141	654	5.1
University of California	106	146	312	168	732	5.7
Public California junior colleges	1,050	2,278	5,368	9	8,705	67.6
Private California colleges	130	192	312	122	756	5.9
Out-of-state colleges[a]	411	536	769	323	2,039	15.7
Total	1,808	3,306	7,009	763	12,886	100.0

[a] Includes out-of-state, U. S. possessions, and foreign country classifications.

Information similar to that contained in Table 16 for the state colleges is found in Table 17 for the University of California. Again as with the state colleges, the largest source of transfer to the University comprised the junior colleges, which supplied 49.3 per cent of the 5,921 transfers to the University in 1956-57. It is of interest to note how little difference there was between the total number of transfers to the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses - 2,539 and 2,508 respectively.

TABLE 17

New Registered Undergraduate Student Transfers to the University of California by Level and Type of Institution of Origin, 1956-1957[a]

From:	Berkeley	Los Angeles	Davis	Santa Barbara	Total	Per cent
California state colleges	167	61	21	20	269	4.5
University of California	435	323	147[b]	36	941	15.9
Public California junior colleges	1,215	1,263	104	339	2,921	49.3
Private California colleges	134	116	16	34	300	5.1
Special action-California colleges	165	341	21	33	560	9.5
Out-of-state colleges (includes foreign)	362	278	25	58	723	12.2
Out-of-state colleges (by special action)	61	126	8	12	207	3.5
Total	2,539	2,508	342	532	5,921	100.0

[a] Figures not available for the Riverside Campus.

[b] Includes 63 Davis Combination Program and Agricultural Experimental Plan transfers.

With such large numbers of transfers to the University - 5,921 in 1956-57 - the requirements for admission with advanced standing become of equal importance with the requirements for admission to freshman standing. Section 306 of the regulations of the Academic Senate provides the following: "Applicants for admission to the University by transfer from other collegiate institutions must meet the requirements set for admission to freshman standing."[5]

Included among transfer students with advanced standing are a considerable number of those not eligible for admission at the time of high school graduation. Application of the principle of "maintaining the standard of preparation required of students who enter the University directly from accredited secondary schools of California" to this group has not been easy, and since 1946 the admissions offices have made and reported many studies of the comparative success of this group of students. On the basis of these studies, a number of changes have been made in the requirements for admission of applicants to advance standing who were ineligible for admission to the University at the time of high school graduation. Under these changes such persons were required to do the following:

1933-52: Make up high school subject deficiencies, and achieve one of the following scholarship standings on college courses acceptable for transfer:

1.5 grade-point average on 15-29 units
1.3 grade-point average on 30-39 units
1.2 grade-point average on 40-59 units
1.0 grade-point average on 60 units or more

1952-57: Make up high school subject deficiencies and achieve one of the following scholarship standings on college courses acceptable for transfer:

1.5 grade-point average on 15-29 units
1.3 grade-point average on 30 units or more
1.0 grade-point average on 60 units or more, provided all requirements for junior standing in the University have been completed.

Effective September 1957: Make up high school subject deficiencies and achieve one of the following scholarship standings in college courses acceptable for transfer:

2.4 grade-point average based on the system of "one unit of 'A' equals 4 grade points" on 30 or more units plus a satisfactory score on the College Entrance Examination Board Scholastic Aptitude Test, or

2.4 grade-point average on 60 or more units

---

[5] Manual of the Academic Senate, University of California, Berkeley, California, January, 1956, p. 69.

These changes that raised both the scholarship and the unit requirements had an immediate and marked effect on the number of such applicants admitted to advanced standing. Those with less than 30 units admitted to the larger campuses of the University declined from 417 in 1953-54 to 16 in 1957-58. At the same time, the scholastic performance improved in 1957-58 over 1952-56 in approximately direct relationship to the rise in the scholarship requirement.

Further account of the studies of transfer students to the University is available in the Office of Relations with Schools on the Berkeley campus of the University.

California Independent Colleges and Universities

The committee did not think it essential for present purposes, nor were the facilities available, to make a detailed study of admission and retention policies in the independent colleges and universities in the state. However, the committee is of the belief that these institutions hold to the criteria this committee has proposed — namely, that their procedures reject students unlikely to succeed and admit those who seem qualified.

In view of the extensive, imaginative, well-financed, and aggressive program of public higher education in California, which apparently envisions the establishment of new public college facilities wherever they are needed, the expansion of old and the development of new independent colleges will almost certainly be extremely difficult and slow. Moreover, some of the private institutions do not wish to increase greatly their enrollment. In fact, some of them have set enrollment limitations in terms of actual numbers. Recognizing the impact of the rapidly developing program of public higher education on private institutions, The Regents of the University and the State Board of Education approved in 1956 the following statement of policy:

> Extension of publicly supported institutions to the degree that the continued operation of private ones long in existence and seemingly serving the community well is jeopardized is not in the public interest.[6]

The statement was reaffirmed by the two boards in Joint Session on April 15, 1959.

Some 20 per cent of current enrollment of the independent colleges is drawn from outside of California. Only a small increase in this proportion seems likely in the near future. Many of the independent schools have expressed a desire to expand the numbers of junior college transfers they matriculate; but since they have not, in general, been very successful in attracting such students in the past, growth here would seem small also.

In the fall of 1958, private institutions in California enrolled 20.8 per cent of all full-time enrollment in higher education in the state. The 1975 predictions of the Department of Finance are that even though the number of full-time enrollees in the private institutions is expected to increase from 46,824 in 1958 to 73,950 in 1975, the per cent of the total in the state will decline from 20.8 per cent in 1958 to 11.2 per cent in 1975.[7]

---

[6] Liaison Committee of The Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education, A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California, State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1957. Page vi.

---

[7] Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960. p. 53.

Section IV

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN RETENTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

Junior Colleges

Classification of Students

The junior colleges occupy a unique position in the California system of higher education since they contribute the bulk of the opportunity for training at the occupational level. The demands of our civilization are such that the realistic conservation of human resources requires concentration upon high calibre vocational education courses designed to qualify the student for employment, for life responsibilities, or for advanced collegiate work.

High schools, colleges, and parents must be convinced of the respectability and importance of the two-year occupational courses in order that the junior colleges will not experience difficulty in fulfilling their educational role. To this end, the word "terminal" in connection with these curricula should be eliminated. Students who pursue this type of education and demonstrate a high level of proficiency should have the opportunity to apply credits earned toward a bachelor's degree granted by an institution where they can continue their occupational education. This co-ordination will give occupational education curricula "status" in the eyes of parents and students.

In order to ensure adequate instructional flexibility, most junior colleges do not establish specific standards which must be met by students prior to enrollment in a program of instruction that leads to transfer to senior college or university. As many as 39 junior colleges have no such standards, while 17 do.

Retention of Students

Probation

1. Scholastic: All 56 junior colleges participating in the 1959 survey previously mentioned place students on probation because of low scholarship. This is a decided improvement over practices prevalent in 1954 when a similar study showed that 26 per cent of the junior colleges maintained no standards of scholarship in order to avoid probation in order to avoid probation or dismissal.

   There is great variation in the scholarship standard for probation as currently applied in California junior colleges. Two schools place students on probation if they fail two-thirds of the units attempted; 19 colleges place students on probation if they fail to maintain a "C" average (2.0 grade-point average); 19 colleges place students on probation if their GPA is below 1.50.

   The number of students placed on probation due to poor scholarship in 1958-59 ranged from zero in one college to more than 1,400 in another. Some colleges placed no students on probation, others placed more than 40 per cent of those enrolled on probation because of low scholastic achievement. On an average (median), California junior colleges placed 18 per cent of their fall (as of October 31) enrollment on scholastic probation during 1958-59.

2. Misconduct. A total of 54 out of 56 colleges place students on probation because of misconduct. However, during 1958-59 only 18 colleges reported actually placing any students on probation because of misconduct.

Dismissal

1. Scholastic. All 56 junior colleges reporting dismiss students because of poor scholarship. During 1958-59, two colleges actually dismissed no students while seven dismissed more than 180 because of poor scholarship. The per cent of the enrollment to be dismissed ranged from zero to more than 20 per cent. On an average (median), each junior college in 1958-59 dismissed 3.3 per cent of students enrolled (as of October 31) because of low scholarship.

   Standards for dismissal because of low scholastic performance vary considerably among junior colleges. Most colleges dismiss students who fail to remove probationary status in one semester.

2. Attendance. A total of 41 colleges have regulations for dropping students from class because of poor attendance. However, during 1958-59 only 19 colleges actually reported dropping students because of failure to attend class.

3. Misconduct. All but two of the 56 colleges maintain procedures for dismissing students because of misconduct. Actually, only 16 colleges dismissed any students because of misconduct during 1958-59.

Graduation Standards

1. Scholarship. A total of 48 junior colleges report that a "C" average in scholarship is required for the Associate of Arts degree. Seven other colleges require a "C" average in 60 or 62 units of work. This means that only one college of those reporting does not require "C" average scholarship for graduation. This represents a decided improvement over conditions in 1954, when 14 colleges graduated students on a "D" average and three others with averages below "C".

2. Units. The majority of colleges (36) hold to the minimum state standard for graduation of 60 units as provided in Section 7805 of the 1959 California Education Code. However, 11 colleges require 64 or more units.

3. Pattern. A total of 48 colleges report having graduation requirements going beyond those specified in the Code section cited in the foregoing. Most of these additional requirements involve general or basic education in such fields as English, social science, mathematics, and natural science. This means that students awarded the A.A. degree complete a sound pattern of basic education as well as a pattern of specialized or vocational education.

4. Certificates of Completion. Altogether 25 colleges issue "certificates of completion" or "certificates of graduation" in addition to awarding

the A.A. degree. These certificates are given primarily for the completion of vocational programs of less than two years in length.

Holding Power

1. Drop-outs. One of the criticisms leveled at higher education is the large drop-out rate of students. Junior colleges actually graduate only a small portion of those admitted.

   The average (median) number of drop-outs per junior college in California in 1958-59 was 550 students. On an average, 24 per cent of the unduplicated enrollment per college dropped out during the year.

2. Degrees Awarded. The average (median) number of A.A. degrees awarded per California junior college in 1958-59 was 212. This represents awarding A.A. degrees in numbers equal to 11 per cent of the unduplicated enrollment.

   Few objective studies have been made giving comprehensive information on student persistence in junior colleges. In September, 1954, Orange Coast College completed a drop-out study involving 1,000 students who entered grade thirteen. Of this group, 610 completed the thirteenth grade, 460 entered grade fourteen, and 350 graduated from the fourteenth grade.

   Offhand, it might seem questionable that only 35 per cent of an entering class graduate. It must be realized, however, that there are many good reasons for students dropping out of junior college. Some justifiable reasons for leaving junior college prior to graduation are the following:

   a. Obtaining good permanent job in occupational field of study
   b. Joining armed forces
   c. Moving to another locality
   d. Transferring to another college
   e. Getting married
   f. Encountering ill health
   g. Encountering financial difficulties
   h. Discovering that aptitudes and interests do not warrant continuance of college experience

   The Orange Coast College study showed that 68 per cent of the drop-outs were for reasons deemed justifiable and to the advantage of the student.

   The junior college, because of its peculiar role, should expect to have a reasonably large drop-out rate. It is a people's college where all may come to pursue education beyond high school, to remove deficiencies, to find themselves, to gain educational maturity, to obtain another chance. Traveling such paths will result in a definite number failing to complete all requirements for graduation.

State Colleges[1]

Policies on Probation and Disqualification

Local policies for probation and disqualification are based on the California Administrative Code, Title 5, Education, Section 938, which reads as follows:

> 938. Probation or Disqualification for Scholarship. Any regular student who during any regular session, semester or quarter fails to maintain a scholarship average of at least 2.0 (grade C on five-point scale) may be placed on probation by the president of the college. Any regular student may be disqualified if the student fails to maintain a scholarship average of at least 2.0.

There is relatively little variance among the state colleges in the establishment of standards for the local administration of the Administrative Code provisions. In general, students are placed on probation under the following conditions:

1. When the cumulative GPA (grade-point average) is less than 2.0
2. When the GPA for any given semester is less than 2.0

One state college currently places students on probation on the basis of grade-point deficiencies, rather than GPA. Another uses a sliding scale, based on the total number of units attempted, for probation and disqualification. A third state college prefers to use the term "subject to disqualification" for students who would normally be on probation, to avoid confusion with nonacademic probation. In general, any student whose average falls below "C" is automatically placed on probation for the following semester.

Students are subject to disqualification under the following conditions:

1. When the cumulative GPA is less than 2.0 at the end of the first semester the student is on probation
2. When the GPA is less than 1.0 for any given semester
3. When the grade-point deficiency reaches a certain level, based on total units attempted at the college or class level

The colleges differ in how they deal with disqualification. Some are able to use committees to review individual cases prior to disqualification, while others are forced to apply standards routinely. While individual review of cases is highly desirable before disqualification, shortages of staff, coupled with increasing enrollments, have made such action impossible at the largest colleges.

Students may apply for readmission after one or two semesters of absence, following disqualification. Applications are reviewed carefully by a committee for evidence of remediation of deficiencies that were responsible for the original disqualification. Colleges with routine disqualification, without individual review, are more likely to readmit students who petition to be reinstated.

---

[1] Because of the extended discussion of disqualification of state college freshmen particularly as it relates to the number of recommending units for admission and scores on aptitude tests as found in Section III, the presentation here deals only with the specific policies on probation and disqualification.

The study of standards for disqualification is under review continually. A number of changes have been made during 1958-59 and more are in prospect for the coming year. Statistics on dismissals will be found in the state college subsection of Section III.

University of California

Probation and Dismissal

Except for the Colleges of Engineering (Berkeley and Los Angeles) and the College of Chemistry (Berkeley), general rules covering probation and dismissal are uniform throughout the undergraduate colleges of the University; administration of the rules differ in the various colleges.

1. Probation (Letters and Science, Agriculture, Applied Arts)

   ...A student shall be placed on probation

   a. If at the close of his first semester his record shows a deficiency of six or more grade points; or
   b. If at the close of any subsequent semester, his grade-point average is less than one (a "C" average), computed on the total of all courses undertaken in this University for which he has received a final report.[2]

2. Dismissal (Letters and Science, Agriculture, Applied Arts)

   ...A student shall be subject to dismissal from the University

   a. If during any semester he fails to pass with a grade of "C" or higher courses totaling at least four units; or
   b. If while on probation his grade-point average for the work undertaken during any semester falls below one (a "C" average); or
   c. If after two semesters of probationary status he has not obtained a grade-point average of one (a "C" average), computed on the total of all courses undertaken in this University for which he has received a final report.[3]

3. Subject to Dismissal (Engineering and Chemistry)

   Students who fall below a "C" average in any semester or summer session, or who fall below an over-all "C" average, are subject to dismissal. The faculty may dismiss or retain on probation and may readmit dismissed students.

The deans of the colleges were asked for reactions to University policy on probation and dismissals as well as the administration policies now followed within the college. That there are marked differences in administration of the rules appears from examination of the statistics of "probation," "subject to dismissal but allowed to continue on probation," and other classifications designed by individual colleges. The statistics themselves may be misleading. In an effort to ease the difficulty of acceptance in another college, the College of Engineering at Los Angeles has adopted a device "not permitted to re-enter without approval of the Dean," and the consequent statistics show no dismissals since June of 1954, but the per cent actually dismissed under this device is about the same as the officially dismissed on the Berkeley Campus College of Engineering.

---

[2] Manual of the Academic Senate, University of California, Berkeley, January, 1956; Section 1332.
[3] Ibid.

The responses of the deans give the impression that most of them would like a more uniform policy on probation and dismissal throughout the University. Two deans emphasize the importance of dismissing the incompetent student before the junior year, so there will be no difficulty in entering a junior college. Evidently, comparatively little use is made of the counseling centers by students on probation. Within the colleges the attitude on special advice or help varies from a required interview with a faculty adviser to no requirement at all.

The problem of uniform policy on probation, dismissals and readmission seems impossible of solution so long as the dean of each college operates independently. A campus-wide committee operating under uniform rules might improve the present situation and might especially help the capable but misplaced student.

A survey of a small group of dismissed students showed that they had a 3.3 grade-point average in high school, as compared with an over-all 3.4 grade-point average for the entire freshman class. This small difference in the preparatory school record indicates that what goes wrong with the student may be external to either training or ability, and that some students of exceptional ability may be in the dismissed group. The loss of potentially capable students through questionable dismissal policies may represent a great social loss.

Effort was made to get University-wide information on the over-all results of dismissals from the University resulting from the application of the foregoing regulations. Since no such compilation was found, the alternatives were to include separate tabulations for each of the major campuses or to include data from a single campus to illustrate the effect of these regulations. The latter plan was chosen; therefore, two tables prepared by the Registrar's Office on the Berkeley Campus are included here.

The first of these, Table 18, shows by colleges and schools on the Berkeley Campus the ratio of undergraduate dismissals to the total number of such students enrolled in each of these colleges and schools for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958. It will be noted that the roles of dismissal are highest in chemistry, engineering, and letters and science. At the other extreme are nursing and pharmacy, in which no dismissals occurred during the three-year period; and in criminology only one student was dismissed in the three-year period.

The other one, Table 19, shows the rate of dismissal by class on the Berkeley Campus for the year 1957-58. It will be noted that, contrary to expectation, the heaviest loss of students due to dismissal is in the sophomore year rather than the freshman year, with 12.0 per cent and 6.8 per cent respectively. As would be expected, the dismissal rate in the graduate area where the students are more mature is relatively low, i.e., 1.3 per cent.

TABLE 18

Undergraduate Dismissals in Relation to Total Undergraduate Enrollments by Colleges and Schools on the Berkeley Campus of the University of California--by Years 1956, 1957, and 1958

College or school	No. of students enrolled			No. of dismissals			Per cent of dismissals		
	1956	1957	1958	1956	1957	1958	1956	1957	1958
Agriculture	313	339	398	6	5	9	1.9	1.5	2.3
Architecture	447	497	569	3	10	12	0.7	2.0	2.1
Business Administration	723	727	651	24	18	30	3.3	2.5	4.6
Chemistry	350	410	472	24	35	61	6.9	8.5	12.9
Criminology	115	127	115	0	1	0	0.0	0.8	0.0
Engineering	1,738	1,746	1,910	105	69	139	6.0	4.0	7.3
Forestry	59	70	65	2	2	2	3.4	2.9	3.1
Letters and Science	8,209	8,276	8,367	328	294	433	4.0	3.6	5.2
Nursing	53	44	53	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Optometry	48	65	69	1	3	0	2.1	4.6	0.0
Pharmacy	82	65	a	0	0	-	0.0	0.0	-
Public Health	89	96	138	1	1	4	1.1	1.0	2.9
Total	12,226	12,507	12,806	494	438	690	4.0	3.5	5.4

[a] The College of Pharmacy will have no students on the Berkeley Campus in the future.

Source: Registrar's Office, Berkeley Campus.

TABLE 19

Per Cent Dismissals Within Each Class, Berkeley Campus University of California, 1957-58

Class or status	Net year totals	Total dismissals during 1957-58	Per cent
Freshmen	3,093	209	6.8
Sophomores	3,476	417	12.0
Juniors	4,299	283	6.6
Seniors	3,839	192	5.0
Special students	100	10	10.0
Limited students	146	1	0.7
Undergraduates	14,953	1,112	7.4
Graduates	6,060	77	1.3
Total	21,013	1,189	5.7

Source: Registrar's Office, Berkeley Campus.

Independent Colleges[4]

The independent colleges generally assert that they hold to the criteria the committee has proposed, namely, that their procedures reject students unlikely to succeed and admit those who seem qualified, with the exception of a few of the highly competitive colleges where students of unquestioned academic promise are denied admission because of the limitation in space.

On the fragmentary evidence available, most of the independent colleges disqualify for academic reasons a small per cent of their students. Certainly they disqualify considerably less than either the junior colleges or the state colleges. Skeptics may suggest that this means only that academic standards are made to conform generally to the aptitude and performances of the students in question. It is true that some of the least selective colleges disqualify the fewest students for academic reasons, but this is not conclusive evidence for the skeptical viewpoint.

There is a wide range in the requirements of the various colleges. Some approximate the standards of the junior colleges while others are even more selective than the University.

---

[4] As noted earlier in this report, the committee did not think it necessary - and, in fact, time did not permit - to gather as complete information on the practices with respect to probation and dismissal in the independent institutions as for the publicly supported ones. Consequently, the comments here are brief and in very general terms.

Section V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations of the Technical Committee on Selection and Retention of Students are presented in four categories, deriving from the six assumptions on which the deliberations of the Committee were based. In this section, the assumptions are made explicit and then the conclusions and recommendations[1] are presented. The order of presentation is the following:

1. Basic assumptions in regard to selection, retention, and enrollment limitations
2. Improvement in admission or selection procedure
3. Retention policies
4. Proportionate size of lower and upper divisions in the state colleges and in the University
5. Study of state and institutional scholarships

1. Basic assumptions in regard to selection, retention, and enrollment limitations

The conclusions and recommendations of this committee stem from certain basic assumptions that guided the deliberations and shaped the conclusions reported here. (It should be noted at this point that, members of the committee dissented from certain of the recommendations. The reasons for those dissents appear on the appropriate pages of this section.)

It has been assumed that:

a. The State of California will continue to provide adequate higher educational facilities for all qualified students.

b. All available facilities, public and independent, will be necessary to properly educate those California youth who can profit by collegiate instruction and who wish to so prepare themselves in the years between now and 1975.

c. Even though California independent colleges will expand their enrollments in the next 15 years, most of the additional facilities needed for higher education will be provided by the public institutions.

d. As much of the necessary expansion of lower division facilities as possible should take place in the junior colleges.

---

[1] The recommendations as they appear in this section are designated by Roman numerals.

e. No limitation of lower division enrollments in the University and state colleges should be undertaken before the fullest possible use of existing facilities has been achieved.

f. The more capable high school students should have the greater freedom of choice of collegiate institution, and selection procedures should give preference to the more able.

g. Procedures and standards for selection and retention of students must be educationally justifiable and reasonable.

2. Improvement in admission or selection procedures. Most able students should have greatest freedom of choice.

It is recommended that:

(I) Restriction of free choice of institution for demonstratedly able freshmen should be made only when there is:

   a. A shortage of instructional facilities in a particular institution that is met in another readily available college; or

   b. A necessity for use of available facilities for upper division or graduate work.

(II) Shortages of instructional facilities should be regularly reported to institutional governing boards and to the liaison agencies.

Admission to the Junior Colleges

(III) It is recommended that:

   a. Present legal requirements governing admission to the junior colleges be maintained without change[2] except that applicants neither legally nor actually resident in California who wish to come solely for the purpose of attending college be required to be in the upper half of their high school graduating class to be eligible. (In the case of colleges in border communities, the nonresident provision should be waived.)

   b. Admission of non-high school graduates be based on previous scholastic record, test scores, seriousness of purpose, and, if a recent high school student, the recommendations of high school authorities.

   c. Students seeking to transfer to a junior college from other types of colleges or universities not be denied admission solely because of previous poor scholastic performance. Consideration should be given to the total past record of the student, to change of objective, to circumstances leading to scholastic difficulty, and to other related factors. It is further recommended that applicants admitted with poor scholastic records in other colleges be admitted on probation, with the intent to dismiss if the first semester's record does not give promise of scholastic success.

---

[2] "We cannot support the position the committee takes regarding the admissions standards of the junior colleges. Presently, students are not required to demonstrate reasonable minimum standards either of aptitude or of achievement in any field. We should request the Junior College Association to establish standards which limit admission to students who have demonstrated a reasonable promise of benefiting from the instruction offered."--J. Edward Sanders and Grant W. Jensen

Applicants Eligible to Freshman Standing in the State Colleges and University of California

(IV) It is recommended that continuous study be made by the University and state colleges in order to perfect means of selection and that the state colleges devote intensive effort to determining the answers to the following questions:

a. What number of recommending grades from the high schools should be required? Should such recommending grades be entirely in academic courses? Should a limited number of recommending grades in nonacademic courses be accepted toward admission? Should recommending grades in both academic and nonacademic courses be accepted at equal value?

b. At the point where the number of recommended units becomes marginal in predicting success in the state colleges, what weight should be given to aptitude tests in determining minimum or basic requirements for admission?

Applicants Ineligible for Admission to Freshman Standing in the State Colleges and University.

(V) It is recommended that:

a. The state colleges and the University require a minimum of 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit before considering the admission of applicants ineligible for admission to freshman standing because of inadequate grades in high school courses.[3]

b. The University and state colleges carefully examine their present procedures in admission to freshman and sophomore standing as "exceptions to the rules." The committee believes that when adequate facilities are available in junior colleges to meet the needs of individual students of whatever age, only the most compelling[4] situation can justify admission of "exceptions" to crowded freshman and sophomore classes.

---

[3] Except in curricula that require earlier transfer.

[4] "I would prefer this statement to read: Only after the admissions officer is completely satisfied that a student has strong potential for success in college, and then only if there is substantial supporting evidence, should there be admission of 'exceptions' to crowded freshman and sophomore classes." — Ralph Prator.

c. Unless the changes made in 1959 (See Section III for those changes) in the method of admission by examination result in markedly improved performance, the University abandon its present policy of admission by examination.

Admission at the Junior Level

The committee defines "junior level" as that point from which a student normally can earn his bachelor's degree in two more years. The preservation of educational opportunity requires that California provide somewhere in its system of higher education a place for all juniors and seniors who can profit from instruction at that level.

(VI) It is recommended[5] that:

a. Care be exercised to see to it that the doors to proper and deserved schooling at the upper division level be kept open.

b. Continued study be made of University and state college procedures in admission to the upper division, and reports of such studies be made regularly to the proper liaison authorities.

c. Consideration of questions related to higher admission standards at the freshman level in the state colleges be accompanied by consideration of relevant changes in standards for transfer students not eligible for freshman admission under such higher standards.

Credit for Junior College Courses

(VII) With some divergence of opinion, the committee recommends that the following policies be continued in determining the amount of transfer credit for junior college occupational courses to state colleges, and for consideration of grade points earned in those courses to state colleges, and for consideration of grade points earned in those courses for admission:

---

[5] "Since the University and state colleges are restricting enrollments in lower division and a higher per cent of students to these institutions will be transferring from a wide variety of lower division experiences, I would like to have had included here a recommendation that a study be made of an appropriate examination to be given to all applicants for junior standing. Such examination scores would give supplemental information to the previous record made by the transferring student and improve the prediction of success in the upper division courses." — Ralph Prator

a. All credit earned in junior college be used by state colleges in computing minimum grade-point averages for admissions purposes.[6]

b. State colleges offering occupational major programs accept credit earned by junior college students in occupational fields when such work is completed with "C" or better grade and that:

   (1) Such credit be used to fulfill state college requirements when it parallels such work; otherwise it may be used as elective credit.

   (2) In recognizing occupational course credit, state colleges impose the same limitations on junior college transfers as are applied to students completing lower division requirements within the state colleges.

Admission of Limited and Special Students

Procedures now in effect in the University seem to operate effectively to admit students of acceptable scholastic quality and to prevent displacement of regular students. The recent action of the state college presidents (and subsequently approved by the State Board of Education), which requires all students enrolling in the state colleges in the fall of 1960 and thereafter to meet regular admission standards, should meet these same goals.

Special Requirements for Out-of-state Students

(VIII) It is recommended that:

a. The legal nonresident who wishes to come to California solely for the purpose of attending college be required to meet higher entrance requirements (e.g., stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible) than are required of resident applicants.

b. Exemptions from these special requirements be granted to:

   (1) Bonafide residents of the state who are not yet exempt from the nonresident fee.

   (2) Sons and daughters of alumni.

---

[6] "We have serious doubts about the advisability of including all junior college courses in the grade-point average required for admission to the state colleges. While it is true that the state colleges have the special function of occupational training at the upper division level, the nature of this occupational training is, or should be, distinctly different from many of the types of vocational training which should be offered in the junior college. Upper division occupational training should be distinctly more 'bookish' than is true of many junior college courses. Admission to a state college should be based on courses acceptable for advanced standing credit -- acceptability in this case means usable toward a bachelor's degree. We believe continued study of admissions procedures will result in proper decisions on this problem."-- Herman A. Spindt and Grant W. Jensen.

(3) Applicants resident in other states but applying for admission to California junior colleges near the borders of adjoining states.

Need for Continued Study of Procedures

(IX) In order to minimize friction among the segments of higher education, it is recommended that:

a. The University and state colleges make continuing studies of the validity of their entrance requirements at the freshman and advanced standing levels.

b. These studies be regularly reported to respective faculties and boards of control and to the over-all liaison agency.

c. The form and content of these studies be determined by a representative committee composed of those actively engaged in administration or research related to admission and representing the following:

1. State colleges
2. University of California
3. Joint Staff
4. California Junior College Association
5. California Association of Secondary School Administrators
6. One representative from the independent colleges

3. Classification, probation, and dismissal policies. Classification and retention in the junior colleges.

(X) It is recommended that:

a. Assignment of students to classes and curricula be based upon good counseling practices rather than upon hard-and-fast rules.

b. Freshman students should not ordinarily be dismissed prior to completion of one year in order that ample opportunity will be afforded for guidance and adjustment.

c. Junior colleges establish a more uniform set of policies on probation, dismissal, and minimum grade requirements for graduation.

d. Junior colleges carefully examine and define the meaning of grades which are assigned to students.

e. The State Board of Education revise Title V of the California Administrative Code to fix a minimum standard for scholastic probation (1.5 GPA is suggested) and for dismissal because of scholastic deficiency (failure to achieve at least a 1.5 in the first semester on probation is suggested).[7]

---

[7] Both of these approved by State Board of Education on September 18, 1959. (See Article 15 of the California Administrative Code)

f. The State Board of Education revise Title V of the California Administrative Code to require for graduation the completion of a minimum of 60 units with "C" average scholarship.

Probation and Dismissal in the University and State Colleges

The committee has no basis for determining whether or not present dismissal policies are educationally effective and in the best interests of society.

(XI) In order to minimize errors in the administration of dismissal policies and the social losses resulting therefrom, it is recommended that:

a. Each institution make detailed studies of dismissal policies to determine the following:

1. Effective means of administration
2. Optimal student personnel procedures
3. The efficacy of the practices of dismissal at the end of the first semester and automatic dismissal (i.e., dismissal without study of the individual record)

b. Junior colleges maintain a liberal policy in the admission of students dismissed from four-year institutions.

c. The state colleges continue past admissions policies that have permitted matriculation of upper division students with grades slightly below a "C" average, provided a study of the student's total record and his educational plans indicate a reasonable probability of success in the new environment.

4. Relative sizes of lower and upper divisions in the state colleges and the University of California.

Lower division education at the public four-year institutions is both more expensive and less accessible than at the junior colleges. The academic records of eligible junior college transfers underline the quality of instruction in the junior colleges. A number of the recommendations of this committee will tend to restrict admissions in the lower divisions of the four-year schools (see recommendations V, VIc, and VIII); but even so, a larger number of students must be persuaded or compelled to attend junior colleges.

(XII) The majority of the committee recommends that the public four-year schools urge more students to attend junior colleges.[8]

There has been a marked tendency for students to attend junior colleges even under conditions of free choice of college, e.g., the proportion of lower division students enrolled on the Berkeley Campus declined from 59 per cent in 1920 to 48 per cent in 1958. This trend could be accelerated if the four-year public colleges would participate wholeheartedly in an educational orientation program toward junior colleges.

(XIII) It is recommended that the faculties and administrations of the public four-year institutions institute such a program with public expression of confidence in the quality of junior college instruction.

Policies and Procedures for Compulsory Limitation

In the belief that changed procedures and policies in admission and voluntary choice of the junior college will not result in sufficient migration of lower division students to the junior colleges, the Master Plan Survey Team asked the Technical Committee on Selection and Retention to devote special study to policies and procedures leading to compulsory restriction of lower division enrollment, i.e., refusal to admit students eligible at the time of high school graduation under regular admission rules. The specific problems fall under two heads or categories:

1. Under what conditions and in what proportions should limitations be established and enforced?

2. What procedures will result in an equitable and educationally efficient limitation?

In regard to these problem categories, the following opinions are submitted:

1. The committee is of the opinion that there is little or no virtue in limitation per se; limitation approaches virtue only because of lower cost and greater accessibility of junior college education. Further, the assumption that as

---

[8] "For a variety of reasons we cannot support the recommendation that all students should be encouraged to attend junior college for the thirteenth and fourteenth grades. Admittedly, it is impossible to compare colleges directly on their effectiveness in stimulating student growth and learning, but the formal studies of this and the overwhelming bulk of expert opinion assert that the stronger four-year colleges have been greatly superior in nurturing the intellectual development of superior students.

"We do not believe that there is any data which would support a recommendation that our most talented students should presently be encouraged to attend junior colleges. The stronger four-year residential colleges can offer cultural advantages which are clearly impossible to a two-year college in which students continue to live at home." — J. Edward Sanders and Grant W. Jensen.

much use as possible be made of existing facilities leads to the conclusion that "across the board" limitation may be highly undesirable and, therefore, may not gain the co-operation of the governing boards whose decision is necessary to effective limitation. Limitation should not be enforced until the local junior college can take care of the students denied admission, or at least until the junior college board of trustees has been given ample notice that limitation will be enforced.

The committee is of the further opinion that there are at least two measures by which it may be determined in a local situation that limitation is desirable. These two measures take slightly different forms on new and old campuses but remain essentially the same in both -- additional building and/or additional staff for lower division purposes. Buildings and instructional services specifically designed for lower division students should not be increased on present campuses of the state colleges or the University. On new campuses, such building and instructional services should be kept at the minimum. A majority of the committee believe that the pattern should be to provide facilities for upper division students first, and only after need develops for lower division students shall buildings and programs be provided for freshmen and sophomores.[9]

2. The committee believes that no method or level of admission to the state colleges or the University in which more than 50 per cent[10] of lower division students achieve grades below a "C" average should be continued. The committee suggests this standard as an equitable starting point if such a starting point is needed to secure proper agreements between the Board of Regents of the University and the State Board of Education. The recommendations under "Improvement in Admission or Selection Procedures" (which appeared earlier in this section) will achieve this equitable starting point.

---

[9] "An undergraduate campus should be developed as a unit. It seems to me impossible that architectural plans could be developed first for upper division work and then buildings added for lower division work, in accord with the recommendation of the majority of the Committee." -- H. A. Spindt.

[10] "The Committee has used as a test of the appropriateness of an admissions standard whether or not 50 per cent of the students who enter complete either one semester or one year with a "C" average. In this judgment it ignores all of those students who drop out before the stated interval. In some institutions this is a very sizable proportion of all of the entering students. It would seem more appropriate to me to use as the criterion the percentage of the entrants who finish the stated interval with a "C" average or better.

"It is true that not all withdrawals should be considered as failures, but a large number are. For example, the student who registers and then withdraws to get married or to keep up payments on a car is as definite a failure from the admissions point of view and the taxpayer's point of view as the student who continues and performs poorly. Successful persistence to the end of the semester or the end of the year is the appropriate test for judging our standards." -- J. Edward Sanders

Five methods of enforcing lower division limitations are suggested as follows:

1. A fixed ratio between lower and upper divisions on all campuses of the state colleges and the University.

2. Assignment of a maximum number of lower division students to each four-year campus.

3. A sliding scale by which a four-year college could reduce its undergraduate enrollment in the lower division by an assigned per cent, e.g., two per cent in the next two years, two per cent in two more years, and so forth. This method could be applied either to individual campuses or to the University and state colleges as a whole.

4. Raising entrance requirements for freshman standing in the state colleges and the University above the level recommended under "Improvement in Admissions and Selection Procedures," and primarily for the purpose of limitation.

5. Regional surveys by committees broadly representative of the institutional interests concerned, as a result of which specific limits would be set for the campuses in that region.

Comments on the Foregoing Suggestions

1. and 2. The establishment of either a fixed ratio between upper and lower division, or assignment of a fixed number of lower division students to each campus, present no serious problems of administration provided a period of time is given to the institution to make proper assignments of space and teaching personnel. The objections to these two procedures seem to be at least three in number:

   a. A fixed ratio applicable to all campuses may not be desirable educationally because of special types of lower division programs on some campuses (e.g., agriculture at Fresno State College).

   b. Except as need arises, there is little justification for limitation of any type, and either the fixed ratio or the fixed number has the weakness that facilities will probably not be fully used on some campuses.

   c. Growth in various sections of the state is uneven; in some sections, it may be desirable to increase rather than decrease the size of a lower division during a period when a junior college is trying to catch up. Whatever type of limitation is established, provision should be made for reasonable local elasticity.

3. The establishment of a "sliding scale" of reduction over a period of years would probably work out reasonably well, provided:

   a. That the "sliding scale" is applied to the University as a whole and the state colleges as a whole, so that local elasticity can be provided for within each system

b. That an acceptable starting point is found, such as the one mentioned above, that no admissions method resulting in more than 50 per cent of freshman students below "C" should be continued

If elasticity is provided for, the committee would regard this procedure as second best to the regional survey procedure.

4. Raising basic entrance requirements to control the size of the lower division seems to the committee very ineffective.

   Basic admission requirements should be the best possible measurement of the student's ability and probable scholastic success that can be developed and should not be changed for any other than educational reasons. The plan seems bad to the committee for the following reasons:

   a. Unevenness of application — institutional growth patterns will vary widely.

   b. Full use of available facilities will be a chance result — the committee predicts wide discrepancies in the use of buildings and instructional staff.

   c. Basic admission requirements would be in a state of continual change — "What average will institution A have to have in 1965?"

   d. It must be remembered that while 15 per cent of high school graduates are eligible for admission to the University, only five per cent choose to attend; in the state colleges, 50 per cent are eligible, 8 per cent attend; the habits affecting choice of college are transitory, especially in relation to individual campuses. In the opinion of the committee, it would be a poor gamble to assume that past habits of college choice would continue exactly as they have in the past.

   e. If limitation of any type is imposed, the effect will be actually to raise the quality of the lowest group of students accepted. Permitting the state colleges and the University to use the results of aptitude tests and not merely the school record will give an equalizing effect to the school records of schools that are severe in their grading as compared with schools that are easy in their grading.

      The fundamental purpose that the Master Plan Survey Team has in mind, namely, raising the quality of students in the freshman classes of the state colleges and the University, can be achieved better by assignment of maximum numbers than by an effort on their part to establish admission requirements by fiat; in the opinion of the committee, admission requirements can properly be established only by long and careful experimentation.

5. Regional surveys of the capacity of University and state college campuses seems to the committee the best procedure in determining what limitations

of lower division enrollment should be enforced.

(XIV) It is recommended that committees be established to conduct such regional surveys taking into consideration all possibilities for solving the lower division enrollment problems of the area. Full capacity of each college could be determined and used, growth of special areas provided for, and admission determined not by changes in basic requirements but on the basis of basic requirements plus aptitude tests. While basic requirements will be the same within the University system, and within the state colleges, acceptance up to the level of full capacity, on the basis of scholastic record and aptitude tests, may mean that minimum eligibility may differ on various campuses of each system.

The committee suggests the following areas, each with a broadly representative committee which would report directly to the co-ordinating agency of The Regents and State Board:

a. North Coast Area: Humboldt State College

b. North Central Area: Chico State College

c. North Bay Area: Sonoma-Solano State College

d. San Francisco Bay Area: Berkeley Campus of the University; Alameda, San Francisco, San Jose State Colleges; Peninsula Campus of the University

e. Stanislaus Area: Stanislaus State College

f. Sacramento Area: Davis Campus of the University; Sacramento State College

g. Fresno Area: Fresno State College

h. Santa Barbara-San Luis Obispo Area: Santa Barbara Campus of the University; California State Polytechnic College

i. Los Angeles City Area: Los Angeles Campus of the University; Los Angeles State College; San Fernando State College

j. East Los Angeles-Orange County-Long Beach-Riverside Area: Riverside Campus of the University; East Los Angeles Campus of the University; California State Polytechnic College, Kellogg-Voorhis unit; Long Beach State College; Orange County State College

k. San Diego Area: San Diego Campus of the University; San Diego State College

If it is desired to reduce the number of areas, the committee suggests the following:

a. Combine "c" and "d", namely, North Bay Area and San Francisco Bay Area.

b. Combine "e", "f", and "g" -- Stanislaus, Sacramento, and Fresno Areas.

c. Combine "i" and "j" -- Los Angeles City and East Los Angeles - Orange County Areas

The study committees should be representative of the University, the state colleges, the independent colleges, the junior colleges, and the high schools of the areas. In addition to an initial recommendation for enrollment limitation, such committees should continue in existence to check and report on results of enrollment limitation, especially on duplication of facilities among institutions.

The Master Plan Survey Team asked the Technical Committee on Selection and Retention to consider the question of political or institutional interference with the various limitation plans. Because each institution will have full opportunity to present its case to regional committees, the Committee believes the regional survey approach to have fewer political difficulties than any other plan. Next in order would be a directed limitation addressed to The Regents and to the State Board of Education, limiting each system to certain numbers, and leaving to each board the determination of what each local campus is to have. Worst, in the opinion of the committee, would be an attempt to set "across-the-board" limitations of any type which did not take local conditions into full consideration.

The Technical Committee wishes to make two additional recommendations in regard to lower divisions of state colleges and the University:

(XV) In order that new campuses of four-year colleges shall not build up a "vested interest" in a lower division, the committee strongly supports the action of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University in Joint Session on April 15, 1959 which was the following:

> No new state colleges or campuses of the University other than those already approved shall be established until adequate junior college facilities have been provided...

(XVI) Duplication of programs within either the state colleges or the University not be permitted if such duplication results in classes of uneconomical size.

5. Study of Institutional and State Scholarships

On the basis of information easily available, the committee made a summary of the distribution of state scholarships. Members of the committee differed in their interpretation of the meaning of these data. Further, the committee wonders whether the present policies of the four-year institutions in the distribution of scholarships between lower and upper division gives proper weight to the needs of the students at these two levels.

(XVII) The committee therefore recommends that a committee broadly representative of public higher educational institutions, independent institutions, and the high schools, study both the institutional and state scholarship programs to determine whether or not a change of balance between lower division and upper division is desirable.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

Appendix

SELECTION AND RETENTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

The materials that follow are as of August 1959. They were obtained by a questionnaire prepared and sent to the junior colleges by Basil H. Peterson, President, Orange Coast College, and a member of the Committee on Selection and Retention of Students. Some of these findings appear in the junior college subsection of Section IV. As will be noted, 56 of the 63 junior colleges then in operation responded. Throughout the summary the numbers generally refer to the number of junior colleges to which the item applies. For example, under item 1.a., the 1 opposite this item means that one junior college will not admit a high school graduate with a poor conduct record.

Participation	Number
Number of junior colleges to answer survey sheet	56

Admission Standards for Beginning Freshmen Students

1. Admit all high school graduates?	Yes-50; No-6

Reasons for not admitting high school graduates:

a. Poor conduct record	1
b. Out-of-state applicant with poor high school record	1
c. Out-of-district applicant with poor high school and test record	1
d. Fails to meet district residence requirements	2
e. Out-of-district applicant with IQ less than 90 or high school record less than six units of "A" or "B" work	1

2. Admit all persons older than eighteen?	Yes-36; No-20

Other admission requirements of 20 colleges for non-high school graduates over eighteen years of age:

a. Good conduct record	1
b. Approval of local high school principal	1
c. Approval of high school principal or one semester or more between "dropping" high school and entering junior college	5
d. Nineteen years of age or over	2
e. "Good" test record and "good" interview	2
f. Approval of director of junior college	2
g. High test record	3
h. Give evidence of maturity	1
i. If out-of-district applicant, must have earned at least six units of "A" or "B" in high school	1

j.	"Good" high school and test record	1
k.	Completed at least two years of high school or have satisfactory GED test record	1

3. All 56 junior colleges admit some non-high school graduates.

Reasons for admitting non-high school graduates:

a.	Over eighteen years of age	44
b.	Recommendation or request of high school principal	10
c.	As superior students	6
d.	A veteran	2
e.	Over nineteen years of age	2
f.	An apprentice	1
g.	High test record	5
h.	Approval of director of junior college	2
i.	Gives evidence of ability to profit from instruction	9

4. Admit some beginning freshmen students on probation? Yes-30; No-26

Basis for admitting beginning freshmen on probation:

a.	Non-high school graduate	9
b.	Poor high school scholastic record	8
c.	GPA in high school less than "C"	8
d.	Low test record (tenth percentile or lower)	12
e.	IQ less than 100	1
f.	Non-high school graduate with low test record	2

Admission of Students from Other Colleges

1. Admit all students wishing to transfer from another college? Yes-11; No-45

Reasons for denying admission to students seeking to transfer:

a.	Dishonorable dismissal from previous college	29
b.	Is subject to dismissal according to standards of junior college	10
c.	Low scholarship in previous college	5
d.	Restrictions placed on foreign students (English, scholastic record, first admission, and the like)	8
e.	Fails to meet residence requirements of district	3
f.	If GPA below 1.5	1
g.	If GPA below 1.75	1
h.	If GPA below "C" average	1
i.	Disqualified from another junior college	4

2. Admit students from other colleges on scholastic probation? Yes-54; No-2

Why placed on scholastic probation?

a. On probation at previous college	23
b. Subject to probation according to junior college standards	7
c. If GPA below 2.0 ("C" average)	13
d. If GPA less than 1.75	3
e. If GPA less than 1.6	2
f. If GPA less than 1.5	4
g. If 7 GP below "C" average	1
h. If has language handicap	1
i. Nonresident of district subject to probation or dismissal	1
j. If previous transcript of record is not on file	1

3. Basis for granting credit earned in other colleges:

a. Full credit if earned in college accredited by regional accrediting association	49
b. On recommendation of AACROA	1
c. Credit earned in nonaccredited college recognized after student proves ability to do college work	2
d. Accept no credit in religion	9
e. Full credit if courses are junior college quality	8
f. Credit may be earned through examination for courses completed in nonaccredited colleges	2
g. All academic credits accepted	2
h. All credit earned in any college accepted	2

Retention of Students

1. Are students placed on probation because of low scholarship? Yes-56; No-0

Basis of scholastic probation:

GPA below 2.00	17
GPA below 1.75	5
GPA below 1.67	1
GPA below 1.60	4
GPA below 1.50	19
GPA below 1.00	1
GP deficiency of 8	1
GP deficiency of 7	2
GP deficiency of 6	1
Fails 1/3 or more of units attempted	2
Fails 2/3 of units attempted	2
Fails to pass 10 1/2 units	1

2. Are students dismissed because of poor scholarship? Yes-56; No-0

Basis of scholastic dismissal:

a. Fails to make "C" average while on probation 17*

---

*Los Angeles junior colleges will permit a student to continue on probation even if he failed to make "C" average if considerable improvement is shown.

b. Fails to make 1.5 GPA while on probation	10
c. Fails to make 1.67 GPA while on probation	1
d. Fails to remove probation status in one semester	12
e. If in first semester, GPA is less than 1.0	4
f. Has GP deficiency of 10 or more	2
g. If pass less than 1/2 of units attempted in any semester	2
h. If fail to make up GP deficiency in two semesters	1
i. If GPA is less than 1.0 after two semesters	1
j. If accumulate 25 GP deficiencies in three semesters	1
k. After 2 semesters on probation	5
l. If GPA is below 1.5	1
M. If GPA is below 1.3	1
n. Fails to earn 1.8 GPA while on probation	2
o. Fails to earn 1.75 GPA while on probation	1
p. Fails to pass 10 1/2 units while on probation	1
q. Decision made on counseling basis	2

3. Are students dropped from class because of poor attendance? Yes-41; No-15

4. Are students placed on probation and dismissed because of misconduct? Yes-53; No-2

5. How permanent is dismissal?

Because of Poor Scholarship	
One semester	24
One semester or more	12
One year	2
Depends upon circumstances	8
May petition for readmission immediately	5
No set time	2
Permanent	2

Because of Misconduct	
One semester or more	23
One year	1
Depends upon circumstances	15
Indefinite period	2
May petition for readmission immediately	2
Permanent	4

6. Students placed on scholastic probation:

Number Placed on Probation	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	3	1
1-100	10	9
101-200	11	8
201-300	6	8
301-400	5	5
401-500	1	3
501-600	2	2
601-700	4	3
701-800	4	2
801-	2	9
No report	8	6
Totals	56	56
Median number of students placed on probation	(200)	(288)

Per Cent of October 31 Enrollment Placed on Scholastic Probation	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	3	1
0.1-10	16	6
11-20	20	25
21-30	7	16
31-40	2	4
No report	8	4
Totals	56	56
Median per cent of students placed on probation	(12.3 per cent)	(18 per cent)

7. Students dismissed because of poor scholarship:

Number Dismissed	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	6	2
1-30	17	14
31-60	4	8
61-90	5	6
91-120	4	7
121-150	1	2
151-180	7	6
181-	4	7
No report	8	4
Totals	56	56
Median number of students dismissed	(38)	(63)

Per Cent of October 31 Enrollment Dismissed Because of Poor Scholarship	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	6	2
0.1-5	31	36
6-10	7	8
11-15	3	4
16-20	1	2
No reports	8	4
Totals	56	56
Median per cent of students dismissed	(3 per cent)	(3.3 per cent)

8. Students placed on probation because of poor attendance:

Number Placed on Probation	Number of Junior Colleges 1957-58	Number of Junior Colleges 1958-59
None	23	24
1-50	6	7
51-100	2	2
101-150	1	1
151-200	0	0
201-250	0	0
251-300	0	0
301-	2	2
No reports	22	20
Totals	56	56

Per Cent of October 31 Enrollment Placed on Probation Because of Poor Attendance.	Number of Junior Colleges 1957-58	Number of Junior Colleges 1958-59
None	23	24
0.1-5	8	9
6-10	1	1
11-15	0	0
16-20	1	1
21-25	0	0
26-30	1	1
No reports	22	20
Totals	56	56

9. Students dismissed because of poor attendance:

Number Dismissed	Number of Junior Colleges 1957-58	Number of Junior Colleges 1958-59
None	21	20
1-25	7	9
26-50	1	2
51-75	0	0
76-100	1	1
101-125	1	0
126-150	0	1
151-	6	6
No reports	19	17
Totals	56	56

Per Cent of October 31 Enrollment Dismissed Because of Poor Attendance	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	21	20
0.1-5	11	14
6-10	5	4
11-15	0	1
No reports	19	17
Totals	56	56

10. Students placed on probation because of misconduct:

Number Placed on Probation	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	19	20
1-10	13	10
11-20	3	6
21-30	1	2
No reports	20	18
Totals	56	56

Per Cent Placed on Probation Because of Misconduct	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	19	20
0.1-5	17	18
6-10	0	0
No reports	20	18
Totals	56	56

11. Students dismissed because of misconduct:

Number Dismissed	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	26	22
1-10	10	16
11-20	0	0
No reports	20	18
Totals	56	56

Per Cent of October 31 Enrollment Dismissed Because of Misconduct	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
None	26	22
0.1-5	10	16
6-10	0	0
No report	20	18
Totals	56	56

Graduation Standards

1. Require a "C" average for A.A. degree?

	Number of Junior Colleges
Yes	48
No	6

2. Number of units required for A.A. degree:

Number of Units	Number of Junior Colleges
60	35
61	0
62	9
63	0
64	10
60-65 (depending on major)	1
Total	56

3. Graduation requirements beyond those specified in Education Code and Title V of California Administrative Code:

	Number of Junior Colleges
Junior colleges having graduation requirements beyond minimum	48
Junior colleges having graduation requirements equal to legal minimum	8

	Number of Junior Colleges
Nature of most frequent graduation requirements going beyond legal minimum	
a. Six units of English or speech	25
b. Additional American history government	16
c. Orientation course	9
d. Mathematics proficiency	14
e. Natural science	8
f. Course in psychology	5
g. Course in humanities	6
h. Residence requirement	6

4. Award "Certificate of Graduation" or "Certificate of Completion" in addition to A.A. degree?

Yes	25
No	31

Types of Certificates Issued:

a. Completion of vocational program	21
b. All requirements of A.A. completed except below "C" average	8
c. Completion of course in technical mathematics and physics (technician certificate - goes beyond A.A.)	1
d. Complete requirements for junior standing in senior college (not all A.A. requirements)	1
e. Completion of extended day program	1

Selection of Students

1. Require admission standards for certain classes or curricula?

Yes	50
No	4
No admission standards, but select best applicants	2

Most frequent classes or curricula for which admission standards exist:	
Mathematics	26
English	32
Natural science	19
Vocational curricula	34
Engineering	5
Social science	14
Registered nursing	9
Foreign language	3

Most frequent types of admission standards:	
Placement exam	40
Prerequisite courses	19
Ability or aptitude test	15
Achievement test	24
Qualifying exam	6
High school grade standard	6
Personal interview approval	7
Physical exam	5

2. Admission standards for students planning to transfer to another college or university?

	Number of Junior Colleges
Yes	17
No	39

Standards required for admission to "transfer" status:

a. Satisfactory performance on aptitude tests	9
b. Meet entrance requirements to college to which plan to transfer	5
c. Eligible for English 1A	1
d. Pass basic mathematics test	1
e. Judgment of counselor	1

Holding Power

1. Drop-outs:

Number of Drop-outs Each Year	Number of Junior Colleges	
	1957-58	1958-59
Less than 100	5	5
101 - 200	3	3
201 - 300	9	7
301 - 400	7	8
401 - 500	2	2
501 - 600	6	1
601 - 700	2	8
701 - 800	2	1
801 -1000	2	5
1001 -2000	6	7
2001 -	4	4
No reports	8	5
Totals	56	56
Median number of drop-outs	(400)	(550)

Per Cent Drop-outs Are of Unduplicated Enrollment	Number of Junior Colleges 1957-58	Number of Junior Colleges 1958-59
Less than 10	3	2
11 - 20	15	15
21 - 30	20	24
31 - 40	8	9
41 - 50	2	1
No reports	8	5
Totals	56	56
Median per cent drop-outs are of enrollment	(23 per cent)	(24 per cent)

2. A.A. Degrees Awarded

Number of A.A. Degrees Awarded	Number of Junior Colleges 1957-58	Number of Junior Colleges 1958-59
Less than 100	11	11
101 - 200	13	13
201 - 300	11	13
301 - 400	5	6
401 - 500	4	3
501 - 600	1	1
601 - 800	0	1
801 -1000	3	0
1001 -	1	3
No reports	7	5
Totals	56	56
Median number of A.A. degrees awarded	(244)	(212)

Per Cent A.A. Degrees Are of Unduplicated Enrollment	Number of Junior Colleges 1957-58	Number of Junior Colleges 1958-59
Less than 10	19	23
11 - 20	27	26
21 - 30	3	2
No reports	7	5
Totals	56	56
Median per cent of A.A. degrees are of enrollment	(12 per cent)	(11 per cent)